

**Vladimir. I. Dal**

# **INVESTIGATION INTO RITUAL MURDERS OF CHRISTIAN BABIES BY JEWS**

**Originally published in 1844**

**Russian Empire**

Google translation in English



## ЗАПISKA O PИTУАЛbНЫХ УБИЙСТВАХ

### FOREWORD

In 1890-1900, in the shops and stores of Moscow second-hand booksellers and book dealers, one could often meet a handsome old man of medium height, rummaging through book rubbish in order to find any rarities. That was the head of the Moscow medical department V. M. Ostroglazov. Remaining with him by chance after his brother, the famous bibliographer I.M. Ostroglazov, some rare publications instilled in him a love for collecting antiquities; he became addicted to this business and devoted his leisure time from office work to it. He collected books on various issues, and by the way, on Jewish. After leaving the service, having even more free time, he began to engage in bibliographic investigations, placing them in the "Russian Archive" published by P.I. Bartenev. Death found him working on a work on rare books on the Jewish question, transferred to the "Russian Archive" for publication, but has not yet appeared in the light. After his death, his entire book collection was donated by his widow T.I. Ostroglazova to Moscow University, in whose library, in a special room, it is now located.

There are many rarities in the collection, including the *rarest* book on the Jewish question - a note by V. I. Dahl. This is a book in a small eighth, on 153 pages, entitled: "Search on the murder of Christian babies by Jews and the use of their blood. Printed by order of the Minister of the Interior. 1844". The book also contains the following search about it, written by V. M. Ostroglazov: "This book *is extremely rare*. Gennadi, a well-known bibliographer, says that in the "World Illustration" of 1872, p. 207, it is said that V.I. It was printed in a small number of copies ("Reference Dictionary of Russian Writers and Scientists Who Died in the 18th and 19th Centuries." Berlin, 1876, vol. I, p. 277). In the "General Library of Russia" or the catalog of books collected by A. D. Chertkov" (Moscow, 1863, page 743, No. 3631), it is said that this book was written by V. I. Dal on behalf of Count L. A. Perovsky. It was printed in the most limited number of copies, which were distributed to very few officials. In "Russian book rarities", published by N. Berezin, M. 1903, part 2, on page 19, No. 77, it is printed: "this book *the rarest*" and on the copy of this book, which he saw, was the following inscription contemporary to its edition: "to print ten copies".

"This book is so rare that, as far as I know, it is not in any of the Moscow libraries. My late brother Ivan Mikh. Ostroglazov did not have it in his remarkable collection of rare books. I, who in my lifetime have reviewed several hundred catalogs of Russian and foreign book dealers, as well as re-read the descriptions of all the libraries of famous bibliophiles, have never come across its name. *There is no price for it*. But if the book by the same V.I. , - was estimated, as can be seen from the catalog, for No. 339, 1903, the famous St. Petersburg second-hand bookseller Klockhov, at two hundred silver rubles, then the price of this book by V.I. babies", which has never been on sale, of course, is incomparably more expensive".

But apart from the foregoing, my copy of this book is in another respect a remarkable rarity. He undoubtedly proves that the Jews are trying with all their might and means to destroy these books, which speak of their deeds that outrage conscience. So, for example, the "Book of the Kahala", compiled by Yakov Brafman and printed in Vilna in 1869, was once in all copies that were in Bely's bookshop, in Odessa, bought up by one wealthy Jew in order to stop its circulation in the public, about which published in "St. Petersburg Vedomosti" of 1870, No. 286, on the 2nd page in the article "Jews in Odessa". You can read about the same thing in the book: Notes on Jews in the Western Territory of Russia. M. 1882, ed. 3rd, p. 165".

"But in the "Book of Kahal" there is nothing that the Jews deny with all their might and means: it does not indicate that among the Jews there is a sect (Hasidim) that really uses Christian blood. This is undoubtedly proved in Dahl's book. Therefore, of course, the Jews watched her especially jealously and tried to destroy her. The well-known publicist and scientist Nikita Petrovich Gilyarov in his newspaper *Sovremennye Izvestia* of June 13, 1875, No. 160, writes the following: 1823) forty years ago? We both read about him and, by the way, heard from the late V.I. he, Dahl, who studied the case, looked through all the documents and compiled a note for the government. By the way, what happened to that note? Where's she? It was printed in a few, maybe seven, eight, more than ten copies, and what a surprise! Instances to which the public could have access, under the influence of some unknown force, began to



disappear one by one. Not only that: about two years ago, even the original, intended for reprinting this note, disappeared from a printing house. We ask the venerable publisher, whom we dare not name without his permission, to respond and confirm our words about the loss of the said original. more than ten copies, and oh surprise! Instances to which the public could have access, under the influence of some unknown force, began to disappear one by one. Not only that: about two years ago, even the original, intended for reprinting this note, disappeared from a printing house. We ask the venerable publisher, whom we dare not name without his permission, to respond and confirm our words about the loss of the said original. more than ten copies, and oh surprise! Instances to which the public could have access, under the influence of some unknown force, began to disappear one by one. Not only that: about two years ago, even the original, intended for reprinting this note, disappeared from a printing house. We ask the venerable publisher, whom we dare not name without his permission, to respond and confirm our words about the loss of the said original.

“In our copy there is an answer to this challenge, proposed by the late P.P. Gilyarov-Platonov. Here is what is written by the hand of the famous writer of the “Russian Archive” P.I. Bartenev on our copy: “This book was written by V.I. Dahl, on behalf of L.A. ) and printed in almost ten copies only. Returning in the fall of 1869 from my first trip to Odessa, I conveyed to V.I. By agreement with Dahl, I took it into my head to reprint this book in the "Russian Archive" with my preface. It was being printed at Mamontov's printing house (in Moscow), when they came to tell me that a Jewish typesetter had stolen several sheets of paper and disappeared from Moscow. A.I. Mamontov purposely went to St. Petersburg to get the stolen item from another copy, but could not find it. Later, I copied what was stolen from the copy of Prince A. B. Lobanov-Rostovsky.”

“In the book of Lutostansky “On the Use of Christian Blood by Jews for Religious Purposes”, St. Petersburg, 1880, ed. 2nd, in the 2nd part, on page 32, the following is printed: “In the first edition of our book, we were deprived of many facts, which were stolen by the Jews. Dahl's essay on the question of blood - in Moscow, was only in the Chertkovo library and the *only* instance. The manager of the library, P. I. Bartenev, decided to reprint this work and gave it to Mamontov's printing house. When they began to type and cut the book into pieces, then the Jew, who was a typesetter in the printing house, let his kagal know and, according to the general advice, the same typesetter broke the glass in the printing house at night, climbed in there, scattered all the typed type, the part of the cut sheets of the composition that was there Dalia grabbed it and sank into obscurity, as is always done with the Jews. The police searched in both capitals, but all in vain. Then printing ceased - Mr. Bartenev took back Dahl's surviving book and already keeps it in the library very strictly under the supervision of his own eye. But then the Jew's slyness again hoped to pull off the remaining work from their all-encompassing tentacles. In Moscow there is a scientist playing the role, official rabbi Minor and in a similar claim, as well as Professor Rabbi Khvolson. Poor Minorchik devoted himself, in addition to his desire, to literature and for about two years he went to study at the Chertkovo library - he came before everyone else and left after everyone else, but during this time he could not reach even to look at the desired work by Dahl. Finally, the rabbi decided to go downstairs to Mr. Bartenev himself (now the publisher of the Russian Archives) and asked him that Bartenev be so kind as to let Minor read Dahl's work, but to this he received the answer that he could not do this for any good. . From that moment on, Rabbi Minor left the Chertkovo library forever.” Literature and for about two years went to study at the Chertkovo library - he came before everyone else and left later than everyone else, but during this time he could not reach to even look at the desired work by Dahl. Finally, the rabbi decided to go downstairs to Mr. Bartenev himself (now the publisher of the Russian Archives) and asked him that Bartenev be so kind as to let Minor read Dahl's work, but to this he received the answer that he could not do this for any good. . From that moment on, Rabbi Minor left the Chertkovo library forever.” Literature and for about two years went to study at the Chertkovo library - he came before everyone else and left later than everyone else, but during this time he could not reach to even look at the desired work by Dahl. Finally, the rabbi decided to go downstairs to Mr. Bartenev himself (now the publisher of the Russian Archives) and asked him that Bartenev be so kind as to let Minor read Dahl's work, but to this he received the answer that he could not do this for any good. . From that moment on, Rabbi Minor left the Chertkovo library forever.” that he cannot do this for any good. From that moment on, Rabbi Minor left the Chertkovo library forever.” that he cannot do this for any good. From that moment on, Rabbi Minor left the Chertkovo library forever.”

“In my copy, at the end of it, as an appendix, eight printed pages from the “Russian Archive”, edition of 1870, are pasted, on which the first pages from the book by V.I. ”, and, in addition, a preface to them (pages) by P. I. Bartenev, which he mentions above, is prefaced. *V. M. Ostroglazov 1906 September 15 days.*

“This book,” as Yu. I. Gessen writes in his work “Jews in Russia”, St. Petersburg. 1906, on page 406, is neither in the Chertkovo Library, nor in the St. Petersburg Imperial Public Library, according to the kind message from the librarian

A. I. Braudo. Golitsyn N.N., the prince, writes that he did not happen to see Dahl's note. (Do Jews Use Christian Blood. Warsaw, 1879, p. 131.)”

These are the results of the investigation about this book by V. M. Ostroglazov, carried out by him immediately after it arrived to him. He continued to work on it until his death, and one must wish that his work, handed over to the editors of the Russian Archive, would see the light as soon as possible.

This “rare” book came to V. M. Ostroglazov from P. I. Bartenev: “This book was bought,” V. M. Ostroglazov wrote on its cover, “from Pyotr Ivanovich Bartenev, who sold it to me at my strong requests. This book was presented to Bartenev by Dal. V. *Ostroglazov*. 1906

The book is accompanied by one printed sheet of its set, which was to be included in the sixth book of the Russian Archive for 1870 (sheet 35, pp. (coll.) 1105 - 1136 and containing the text of the first 38 pages of the book). The text of the book was prefaced by P. I. Bartenev with the following preface:

“Investigation about the murder of Christian babies by Jews and the use of their blood. Reprinting on the pages of the “Russian Archive” this interesting study, which is the greatest bibliographic rarity, we cannot but draw the attention of readers to the fact that it has not only historical, but also modern significance. Not later than in 1852-1853, a case arose in Saratov about the murder of two Christian boys by Jews under circumstances completely similar to those indicated by the author of the Search. No one can guarantee that such cases will not arise in the future.

Not announced officially, but resounding by popular rumor and by persons involved in the investigation of the crime, they leave behind a vague impression of disgust and horror, which feeds and strengthens the already strong popular prejudices against the Jews. The Jews, for their part, by stubbornly denying all the facts revealed by deeds of this kind, strengthen this impression, and in the eyes of the people they all become, as it were, involved in the insane villainy of some extreme fanatics.

“About the injustice of such an opinion, it is completely unnecessary to spread; but common sense and the history of religious persecution show us what a terrible tool it can serve to arouse popular fanaticism. The only way to stop and prevent the innumerable evils arising from such mysterious sweeping accusations can be a full and strict explanation of the facts that gave rise to them. The monstrous sect, which, we dare to hope, is now dying out in some backwoods of our Western Territory (these haunts of Jewish fanaticism and ignorance), in every respect deserves careful study and accurate description. The Jews themselves are most interested in the announcement of its history, its peculiarities. For them, however, it is incomparably easier than for Christian writers to collect the material necessary for this. Let's hope that it is precisely among the Jews that there will be people who will render this important service to their compatriots and at the same time add a new instructive chapter in the history of human errors. Glasnost will take away from evil the fantastic dimensions given to it by the mysterious twilight that has covered it up to now, and, of course, it will also reveal in the Jewish environment itself an energetic opposition to teachings that have nothing to do with faith, which served as the threshold to Christianity.

“A search for the murder of Christian babies by Jews” was compiled on behalf of the Minister of Internal Affairs (Count) L.A. Perovsky V.I. now reprinted with his own obligatory permission.”

A copy of this book by V.I. On the 1st page, by P.I. Bartenev, it is marked: “NB”. These headlines are gaining groats. well. and put at the beginning of the paragraph” (this was done in the 1870 set). The copy bears marks of the names of the compositors, between whom different sections of the book were distributed (Matyushkin, pp. 1-17, 51-62; Shibaev, pp. 17-50, Pakhomov, pp. 63-72, 106-; Bakhar... pp. 83-93, Pashkov, pp. 93-106). Pages 73 - 82 are torn out and replaced with sheets written: 5 - by the hand of P.I. Bartenev, the rest - by scribes.

A Dane by birth, the son of a doctor who served in Lugan, Yekaterinoslav Province. at the plant, V. I. Dal was born on November 10, 1801. After completing the course in the naval corps, he initially served in the Black Sea Fleet; but soon left this service and entered the University of Dorpat in 1821, where he received a doctorate in medicine. For several years he was then a military doctor (in the army and military hospital) until he met L.A. Perovsky, who convinced him to go to his service in Orenburg. Here he stayed for 7 years, and in 1841, as a result of Perovsky's appointment as Minister of the Interior, he moved to St. Petersburg, being appointed an official for special assignments under him. In 1849 - 1859. was the manager of a specific office in Nizhny Novgorod, and upon retirement he lived in Moscow and was engaged in the completion and publication of his Explanatory Dictionary of the Great Russian Dialect.

In 1844, when he wrote the "Note" published later, he was 43 years old, therefore he was in the full bloom of his physical and mental powers. This note, written for the Minister of the Interior, soon received another purpose. Almost *no changeit* appeared in the same year 1844 under a different title: "Information about the murders of Christians by Jews for the purpose of obtaining blood." Its composition was attributed to Privy Councilor Skripitsyn (Director of the Department of Foreign Confessions), who performed this work "by order of the Minister of Internal Affairs, Count Perovsky, for presentation to the Sovereign Emperor Nicholas I, heir to the Tsarevich, the Grand Dukes and members of the State Council." (Reprinted in 1878 in "The Citizen", No. 23 - 25, pp. 485 - 495; No. 26, pp. 513 - 522; No. 27 - 28, pp. 546 - 556. Continuation of historical information after 1844 see *ibid.* Nos. 35-37, pp. 638-640; Nos. 38-40, pp. 649-655. See also for 1879 Nos. 23-28, 35-37).

V. I. Dal, after an introduction and a review of the literature on the question of the use of Christian blood by Jews (pp. 1-40), proceeds "to a calculation of former cases of villainous fanaticism of the Jews and to an examination of the most important of them, or at least those closest to us and therefore more reliable, taken from authentic records and from various books written on this subject" (pp. 40-86). He is in chronological order. gives news of all these cases, starting from the 4th century: in the 4th century - 1, the 5th century - 1, the 7th century - 1, the 11th century - 3, the 12th century - 11, the 13th century - 10, the 14th century - 5, the 15th century - 12, XVI century - 24, XVII century - 39, XVIII century - 7, XIX century - 20, in total 134 cases, and then proceeds to the analysis of the Velizh case: "for positive evidence that this accusation is not slander or fiction, and that more than one torture of the Middle Ages extorted this terrible consciousness from the Jews, it remains to analyze a little closer one of the newest cases of this kind, for example: the Velizh case, which began on April 24, 1823 in the Velizh city police and ended on January 18, 1835, twelve years later, in the general meeting of the State Council." The analysis of this case takes up 87-145 pages of the book. On the last 145-153 pages is the "conclusion" of V.I. must make sure that this accusation is well-founded, as well as the general opinion that they used the blood of these martyrs for some kind of mysterious charms ... No one, of course, will not dispute that in countries where Jews are tolerated, the corpses of babies have been found from time to time, always in the same distorted form, or at least with similar signs of violence and death ... There is not one murder, but a deliberate martyrdom the torture of an innocent baby and, consequently, either the enjoyment of these torments, or a special goal connected with them ... Where do these corpses of innocent children, deliberately distorted in the same way, come from? Why are they found only where there are Jews? Why is it always the children of Christians? And finally, why did these cases always take place exclusively during or near Pascha itself?.. Not only does this savage rite not belong to all Jews in general, but even, without any doubt, is known to very few. It exists only in the Hasidic sect or Hasidim - as explained above - the most stubborn, fanatical, recognizing only the Talmud and rabbinic books and renouncing, so to speak, the Old Testament; but even here it is a great secret, perhaps not known to all of them, and at least, of course, not by all Hasidim and is not always fulfilled; however, there is no doubt that it has never completely disappeared since the spread of Christianity, and that fanatics and Kabbalistic healers still appear from time to time among the Jews, who, with this dual purpose, encroach on the martyrdom of a Christian baby and use the blood him with a mystical-religious and imaginary-magical purpose. Poland and our Western provinces, serving since the Middle Ages as a refuge for hardened and ignorant Jews, still represent the largest number of examples of such fanaticism, especially the province of Vitebsk,

"Search" by V.N.

## **SEARCH ABOUT THE KILLING OF CHRISTIAN INFANTS BY THE JEWS AND THE USE OF THEIR BLOOD**

**Printed by order of the Minister of the Interior.  
1844**

### **INTRODUCTION**

From time immemorial, among all the peoples where Jews live, there has been a belief or tradition that the Jews kill Christian babies as martyrs, needing innocent Christian blood for some mysterious rites. It is only in modern times that the feelings of mankind have become so indignant at such an accusation that in Europe they have begun to resolutely reject it as a meaningless fairy tale and slander. The accusation, of course, is terrible, but meanwhile it is not unparalleled in the annals of the religious [\(1\)](#) fanaticism: not only Indian idolaters subject themselves and others to terrible torments, in the expectation of future blessings - and not only among them there are sects constantly engaged in murder to save the soul - but also in Europe, among Christians, a sect of assassins arose, were erected in for two or three centuries, inquisitorial bonfires, and in Russia itself in the past century, self-burners, tyukalytsiks and abbreviated ones appeared: the first were burned themselves, by entire villages; the second killed each other, both for the salvation of the soul.

Not only the voice of the people accuses the Jews of such a terrible deed; they were repeatedly accused of that before the court. Most of their own confession was not, despite any evidence; but there were also such examples where the Jews were exposed and confessed themselves. One such case would, apparently, be sufficient to recognize the real existence of such villainous fanaticism; but the defenders of the Jews say: the confession was forced by torture and therefore proves nothing. Admitting, however, both this justification and everything that has ever been said and written on this subject in favor of the Jews, there will still remain one circumstance to which proper attention has never been paid, and which not only remains unexplained, but even almost gets the quality and extent of the full evidence; namely, there is no doubt that from time to time the corpses of missing babies were found, in such a distorted form and with such signs of external violence, which are fully consistent with the image of martyrdom and the kind of murder of which the Jews are accused; secondly, these incidents took place exclusively in such places where Jews live; Then the question arises, to what circumstance are we to attribute the recurring cases of martyrdom of an infant, judiciously and carefully tortured to death, if the accusation is unjust? [\(2\)](#) What reason or excuse can you think of for such a villainous torture of a child, if this is not fanaticism? The external signs of the corpse each time showed positively that the death could not have been accidental, but deliberate; and, moreover, deliberate and lengthy: the whole body is gouged or punctured, sometimes shreds of skin are cut out, the tongue and genital parts are cut off, or Jewish circumcision is done on boys; sometimes some members are circumcised, or the palms are pierced through; frequent signs and bruises from tight bandages applied and removed again; all skin abrasions, as if burnt or badly rubbed; finally, the corpse is even washed, there is no blood on it, as well as on the linen, and on the dress, which was taken off at the time of the murder and then put on again. How can a child or his parents give rise to such villainy? Without a purpose it could not be done anywhere ever, and even less still repeated in different places almost the same. A simple murderer would in any case be content with one murder, and some mysterious, important goal in the eyes of criminals cannot be rejected here.

The weak, unsatisfactory search for investigators, various tricks and tricks of the Jews, their impudent and stubborn denial, often bribery, the confidence of the majority of educated people that this accusation is vile slander and, finally, the philanthropy of our criminal laws not only saved the Jews hitherto every time from a well-deserved executions, but they, by their intrigues and oath assurances of innocence and the complete injustice of the slander erected against them, always almost managed to accuse their accusers, who were punished for them, and managed to issue in 1817 the Highest Command (dated February 28, announced March 6), who were forbidden even to suspect the Jews of such a crime, and the opinion that the Jews needed Christian blood was called prejudice. Meanwhile,

## TALMUD

Although the Jews, from ancient times already, have placed their Talmud incomparably higher than the Old Testament, they were no less able to distort the meaning of one verse of Holy Scripture in the most absurd way and base on it the monstrous rite, which is spoken of here. The prophet Balaam, called to curse the Jewish people, refuses this and, on the contrary, gives him inspired praise, using several allegories. He says, among other things:

“Behold, the people, like a leftist [\(3\)](#), will rise up, and like a lion will be lifted up (Jacob); he will not fall asleep until he has eaten and the blood of the slain will drink (Book of Numbers, chapter 23) ” [\(4\)](#) . Here, as they say [\(5\)](#) , is the source of the inhuman rite. The interpreters took this allegory in the literal sense and explain that the blood of the enemy [\(6\)](#) - and the Jews consider the Christian to be their first enemy - should be saturated.

The Talmud, compiled from various traditions and supplemented in the first centuries of Christianity, breathes such malice against all non-believers, and especially against Christians, that there is no villainy that it would not allow against them. Written in a barely comprehensible mixture of Hebrew, Chaldean, Syriac, Parti, Greek, Latin, and other languages, the Babylonian Talmud (7), completed in the 5th century, consists of 36 volumes per sheet and contains an incredibly senseless, ugly and immoral interweaving of extravagant fiends of fanaticism. Therefore, the language of the Talmud cannot be called proper Hebrew; it is a special Talmudic language, the most difficult of all living and dead languages, not even excluding Chinese. The Talmud is not only written mystically, mysteriously and incomprehensibly for the uninitiated, it has even remained inaccessible to us to this day, because it has not been translated, except for some passages, into any language. But this is not enough: in the printed Talmuds in Hebrew, omissions are made, sometimes indicated by spaces, brackets or the word: *knew*, i.e., guess, seek the meaning. The Venetian edition of the Talmud of 1520 is said to be complete and contains many, though obscure, but clearly relevant passages, subsequently the Jews were careful and filled up the omissions with notes or verbal study. In the Hebrew book *Seder-Godaido* the reasons for these omissions are also explained: it says that the frequent conversion of the Jews to Christianity, during its first centuries, forced the rabbis to take and include in the Talmud especially strict and cruel measures against the Nazarenes; these decrees, however, drew the attention of governments to themselves in the 9th century, the persecution of Jews followed almost throughout Europe, which is why these places were partly excluded from the Talmud, and partly attributed not to Christians (goy), but to idolaters (Akum), although Jews in this respect do not make any distinction and mean both here and there, even predominantly, Christians. During the time of Pope Gregory, indeed, the persecution of the Jews became common almost throughout Europe, and the reason for this was their fury and villainy against Christians, although our philanthropic age attributes these persecutions for the most part to the savagery and intolerance of Catholicism alone. The rabbis were compelled to defend the secrets that were publicly disclosed, and, despite the huge sums they used for bribery, they were forced to exclude from their books everything that related to the harm and reproach of Christians. Complete Talmuds, without gaps, sought refuge in the Polish possessions, where the Jews generally lived more freely and supervision over them was weaker. The more fanatical, stubborn Jews also hid here, and they nest in these parts. still today, while enlightenment and supervision significantly changed the other European Jews and softened their morals. Regardless of this, there are many explanatory rabbinic books, as they say, up to 50 tons, kept in great secrecy, and there exist among the rabbis, special, so-called Kabbalistic sciences, serving to explain, at will, the dark places of the Talmud. That is why the Talmud is inaccessible even to our learned philologists, whose evidence of what is and what is not in it is not at all reliable. Finally, there are also verbal traditions and teachings among the Jews, kept secret, but occasionally discovered by converted Jews.

## CONVERSED JEWS AND WRITERS

The latter include, for example, a former rabbi, a monk Neophyte, who wrote in 1803 in Moldavia the book "*Refutation of the Jewish Faith*"; the Jews, as they say, persuaded the sovereign of Moldavia, for big money, to destroy this book; despite the fact, however, its translation into modern Greek appeared in Iasi in the same press in 1818. Here it is said, among other things, "about the blood stolen by the Jews from Christians, and about its use"; describing all the details of this monstrous rite, the monk Neophyte concludes as follows: "When I reached the age of thirteen (the age of majority among the Jews), my father revealed to me the sacrament of blood, threatening with terrible curses if I discovered this secret to anyone, even my brothers; if in time I have children, then I can reveal what I have learned only to one of them, the most reliable, intelligent and firmer in my faith. I was, and am now, in great peril for discovering this mystery; but, knowing the true faith and turning to my Savior, in him I place my hope." The neophyte explains the following:

"This rite is written in books not clearly, but only mysteriously; the secret is not known to everyone, but only to the rabbis, hakams and Pharisees, who are called *Hasidim* (8). These Jewish fanatics believe, firstly, that by killing a Christian they are doing what is pleasing to God; secondly, they use blood for charms, according to superstitious rites. For this, on the day of the wedding, the rabbi gives the newlyweds a baked egg, sprinkled, instead of salt, with ash from a piece of linen soaked (9) in the blood of a Christian martyr." This circumstance is extremely remarkable, because in the investigative cases on suspicion of Jews in the murder, it was found that they soaked the canvas in blood and divided it among themselves into shreds. "Young people eat an egg," Neophyte continues, "and the rabbi reads a prayer in which he wishes them to deceive Christians and feed on their labors. Jews, fanatics, also use the blood of a murdered Christian during circumcision, putting a drop of blood from a circumcised child and another drop from a Christian baby into a cup of wine. And this information is no less remarkable, because it is repeated in various other

testimonies, as set out below, and is also found on the occasion of criminal cases on this subject; so, in the Velizh case, the soldier Maksimova testified that the Jews needed blood, according to them, for a Jewish woman in childbirth;

The neophyte also says that the Jews, when they eat their unleavened bread on Passover, spewing all possible blasphemy against Christians, bake one unleavened bread separately, sprinkling it with ashes with Christian blood; actually this unleavened bread is called *efikoimon*. And this circumstance is confirmed by the investigations in similar cases, as well as in the aforementioned Velizh case; there, three Christian women, workers of the Jews, testified, each separately, that they themselves kneaded the dough for matzah (unleavened bread), putting there a little of the blood obtained by the Jews. Anyone who lived among the Jews knows that they really bake some special, sacred to them, unleavened bread, not only separately from the others and at a different time, on the night before their Passover, but that during the manufacture of this mysterious unleavened bread, all children, women and household members are expelled from the room and the door is locked. In this unleavened bread, the Jews of *the Hasidim sect* they put, if they can get it, Christian blood. The remark of some intercessors for the Jews, that if this were true, then the Jews would not need to encroach on murder, but they could always get blood in any barbershop, is completely unfounded: the sacrament of this frenzied rite requires precisely martyr Christian blood from an innocent baby, and not blood from a patient who has undergone bloodletting in the barbershop. Even in those cases where the Jews were really content with obtaining blood without killing a person, bloodletting was nevertheless always accompanied by violence, as can be seen below from former cases: cutting off the tip of the tongue of a peasant in Volhynia in 1833 and forcibly bleeding a girl in Lutsk, in 1843.

The neophyte further says that the Jews also smear themselves with Christian blood in order to be healed of various ailments; that during the funeral of such savage Jews, egg white with Christian blood is also used; that on the holiday of *Purim*, in February, in memory of Mordecai and Esther, fanatical Jews kill a Christian instead of Haman, bake triangular honey cakes with a particle of his blood and send them everywhere. At the same time, Neophyte says, the Jews steal, if possible, Christian children, keep them locked up until Easter, and then commit their terrible murder on them, torture them, as Christ was tortured, and prefer children for this, probably because they are easier to get and that they are easier and safer to manage, as well as for the sake of their integrity. The neophyte concludes with the above confession about the communication of this secret by his father to him, about the spells and threats of the father never to reveal it; "but," he says, "having recognized our Lord Jesus Christ as my father, and the Church as my holy mother, I now declare the whole truth" [\(10\)](#).

According to the testimony of other converts, Jews use three means to facilitate the birth of a woman: the husband stands at the door and reads the 54th chapter of the prophet Isaiah; then he brings five books of Moses from the synagogue; and, finally, *dried blood is given to the woman in labor*. Many assure that this is blood from a Christian baby, which is confirmed by the following extracts from Jewish books, which specifically say that human blood *for our benefit* (from ailments) is allowed to be eaten, as well as a criminal case in the Minsk province of 1833, where, as mentioned above, Fekla Selezneva testified that the Jew Sabunya asked her to get blood, even a few drops, from the little finger of a girl for a Jewish woman in childbirth.

Here is another savage reason for the use of Christian blood by the Jews: the Savior said to his disciples: "*This is my body and my blood*," on which we base the communion of St. mysteries as the body and blood of Christ. In desecration of this holy act, the Jews of the fanatical sect of the Hasidim interfere with Christian blood, martyredly obtained, into their unleavened bread, and say: so let us eat their body and blood, as the prophet Balaam also commanded [\(11\)](#). Many writers of the past two centuries have written about this subject and positively denounced the Jews for the martyrdom of Christian infants and the use of their blood. From these works, named after this, most of the cases and examples below have been selected, with the exception of those taken from genuine office work in Russia and Poland.

So, more than thirty writers have spoken on this subject at various times; they are evidenced by many examples that were at different times and in different states, analyze the secret teachings of the Jews, the meaning and significance of this inhuman rite, and prove its real existence. Brenz, for example, being himself a converted Jew, says very positively that this brutal rite exists, although it is kept in great secrecy, even among the Jews.

Pikulsky's book on the Jews (Ziosc Zydowska) published in Lemberg in 1760 says: on the 15th day of the month of Shaivat, the foreman calculates how much money the synagogue has collected for Christian blood, for which all Jews, from the age of thirteen, pay a fee; then special Jews are hired to catch the child who is kept in the cellar on occasion, fed well for forty days and martyred. At the same time, they are trying to get a particle of the Holy Mysteries (Hostye



Konsecrowana), for reproach over them according to a special rite. All this is confirmed to some extent by the Velizh and other criminal proceedings: in the first, it is clear from the intercepted correspondence of the detained Jews that they remind some elected officials of their duty to try and intercede in this case; and it is immediately clear that the Jews bribed, by the way, a woman, so that she steals an antimension for them from the church and, without swallowing the Holy Mysteries during communion, spit them out into a handkerchief and bring them to them, which she did. Similar cases are found repeatedly among Byzantine historians, and the same is confirmed by Rabbi Serafinovich, who was in Brest at the beginning of the last century, who was baptized and later described the atrocities of the Jews. He says, among other things, that he himself bought the Holy Mysteries from sacrilegious Christians for the aforementioned desecration.

Pikulsky further asserts that the secret Jewish book of Zevhelev explains the barbaric rite of killing babies in this way: a few decades after the crucifixion of the Savior, the Jews saw with horror that the faith of Christ began to spread strongly; they turned to the oldest Talmudist, the Jerusalem rabbi Ravasha (12), who found a remedy against the danger threatening them in the Jewish book Rambam., where it is said: "every harmful thing can only be destroyed, as through the sympathetic application of another thing of the same kind." To prove this, the book of Rambam says that after the murder of the prophet Zechariah in the temple, the blood boiled in this place and could not be erased by anything. Prince Nabuzardan, seeing this, asked about the reason for such a phenomenon and, having received in response that it was the blood of slaughtered animals, ordered to make an experiment with him, whether the blood of Animals would boil in this way. Convinced of the deceit, he forced the consciousness of the high priests about the murder of Zechariah by torture and, wanting to avenge the Jews for the death of the prophet and calm his blood, he ordered to slaughter many Jewish babies in the same place until the boiling blood was quenched, and really achieved his goal by this means.

Serafinowicz recounts the entire order of this heinous, inhuman rite, not only as a witness, but as an actor; he says exactly: "I ordered one child to be tied to the cross, and he lived a long time; he ordered another to be nailed, and he soon died. He also says that the baby is first rolled in a barrel, a circumstance that was confirmed in all almost criminal cases of this kind, and also that a special knife with a gold handle and a silver vessel are kept for the slaughter of the baby, and in the case of the Velizh incident it is said about a knife in a silver frame, which was even found, although its purpose was not positively discovered; Serafinowicz assures that in the Jewish book *Gulenta* talking about this barrel; that the rabbi says at this action: "we shed the blood of this illegitimate one, as we already shed the blood of their God, also illegitimate." In complete copies of the Talmud *Senhedrin*, according to Serafinowicz, in chapter 7 it is said: "the children of Christians are illegitimate, and the scripture commands to torture and kill illegitimate". The Talmud calls dead Christians carrion, dead, and therefore does not order them to be buried; Pikulsky says precisely that a tortured child is not buried, but thrown somewhere, or thrown into the water: meanwhile, almost all such atrocities were actually revealed only because the distorted body of the baby was accidentally found in a field, in a forest, or floated on the water; and if the Jews were not obliged by their beliefs to throw away the simply distorted corpse of a martyr, then it would be difficult to understand why they do not try to bury it and hide it in such a way that it at least does not catch the eye of the first passerby.

Pikulsky further explains why (13) the Jews need the blood of a Christian baby: on a certain day, the Zuvers smear the doors of a Christian with it; newlyweds are given an egg with this blood; at (14) funerals, they smear the eyes of the deceased with egg white with blood; some of this blood is placed in matzah or unleavened bread and some of the unleavened bread is kept in the synagogue until fresh blood is obtained, soaking it in water and using instead of blood when the baby cannot be obtained. Blessing the Jew for happy trading and deceit, the rabbi also gives him an egg with this blood. On the holiday of *Purim* (Hamana), Jews send gifts to each other, also with blood. Also, says Pikulsky, they use this blood for various spells, which is allegedly hinted at in the book of the Talmud, *Hohmes Nyster*, though not clearly stated. All this is quite consistent with Neophyte's testimony above and with many criminal cases.

Further, says Pikulsky, in the book *Senhedrin*, ch. 6 and 7, it says: "If your child is disposed towards Christians, then kill him; killing a Christian is a godly act. If a Jew kills a Jew, then let him be punished with death; if he kills a Christian, he is not subject to punishment (15). If a Christian sacrifices his child to God, he has a great merit." The last Jews interpret as follows: it says Christian to hide the real meaning, but it means that the Jews must sacrifice Christian children. But the main interpretation of this vile rite, says Pikulsky, is that by killing Christian children, the Jews are believed to *kill Christ in them, and that the bitterness of the Jews against Christians can only be sated with Christian blood.*

Pikulsky says further that the Jews, in case of failure, try to buy a baby slave in Tsar-grad; that a boy should not be more than thirteen years old, and that the Jews generally take only boys for this, because Jesus Christ was a man. The examples below prove that Jewish fanatics sometimes also kill girls, and even adult men and women. For some charms, says Pikulsky, Jews also use blood released from the hand of a Christian, which is indeed confirmed by the case in Lutsk in 1843, which will be discussed below, where the Jews forced bloodletting from the hand of a Christian girl.

At the debate held in 1759 in Lviv by the Talmudists with their opponents, Jews who do not recognize the Talmud, there were also arguments that *whoever believes in the Talmud also believes in the use of Christian blood*; words: *Yainudim* red wine and *Yain-Edym* (16) - Christian wine is written in Hebrew with the same letters, and the whole difference lies in the signs that replace vowels; and therefore it is said that it is not wine that is meant here, but Christian blood.

In the book *Fables of the Talmuds*, published first in Polish in Krakow, and then, in 1794, in Russian in the Pochaev Monastery, it is also stated that in the month of borne (April), the Jews crucify and torture a Christian baby if they can get it, and that about it. it is said in the Talmud books *Zichfelef*, *Hohmes* and *Naiskobes*, although the meaning is hidden and obscure. The writer says that the Jews need the blood of this baby: 1) for charms against Christians; 2) for a wedding ceremony; 3) for a ceremony at a funeral; 4) for unleavened bread or matzah; 5) for happy trading turnovers; 6) for the feast of Haman, where the rabbis put this blood in the brush and send it out in the form of a gift. Eisenmenger (17) also says that the Jews, according to the assurances of many writers, use the blood of the babies tortured by them in the form of witchcraft, to keep the bleeding during circumcision; for sexual arousal, for women's diseases, and finally, in general, for sacrificial reconciliation with God. It was explained above why the Talmud still constitutes a mystery inaccessible to us, it was explained that all current copies of it are incomplete and the meaning of dangerous places is obscured with the intention of extremely cunningly and mysteriously, as a rule, one should not read the words that are written, although they make sense, but rearrange the letters, and then a completely different thing will come out; in other places, words are inserted, of which each letter means a whole word, and, consequently, the imaginary word contains a whole saying. Despite this, however. The Talmud is still so rich in senseless fanaticism and disgusting to mankind that, of course, there is no villainy that it would not allow the Jews against a Christian. No matter how you force a Jew to utter an oath that applies to a Christian, in any case it will be insignificant and will never bind a single Talmudist. Everything that is said in the Old Testament about people, about man and humanity, the Jews refer specifically and exclusively to themselves only because they are only people, and other peoples, on the basis of the Gemara, are cattle or animals. Let us cite, for example, several extracts from the Talmud made by the baptized Jew Pozdersky regarding the Velizh case, "You Jews are people, and not other peoples of the world" (Talmud, book. Bove-mezie, section 9). Therefore, the Talmud allows any offense, violence and theft of a Jew from a Gentile: "Take nothing from your neighbor, as the commandment says; but your neighbor is a Jew, and not the other nations of the world." (Talmud, book. Senhedrin, section 7, sheet 59). Thus, the Talmud interprets - the Old Testament from point to point and everywhere makes this distinction, calling a person and a neighbor a Jew, an Israeli, but by no means a non-Christian.

"Bless the deceased if you meet the coffin of a Jew, and curse the dead of another people and say: your mother is dishonored, she who gave birth to you blushes, and so on." (Talmud, book. Broches, section 9, sheet 58).

"If anyone says that God took on human flesh, then he is a liar (epikoiros) and worthy of death; therefore, it is permissible for a Jew to testify falsely against such a person." (Talmud, Prince Senhedrin).

"A non-believer who killed a non-believer, likewise a Jew who killed a Jew, is punished by death; but a Jew who kills a non-Christian is not subject to punishment." (Book of Senhedrin, sec. 7, sheet 59).

"If a non-Christian reads the Talmud, then he is worthy of death, because the Old Testament says: "Moses gave us the law as a heritage; i.e. gave to us, but not to other nations." (Ibid.). It remains to refute one more proof given in favor of the Jews, that is, that the law of Moses forbids them, as you know, to eat blood. We answer this: firstly, according to the teachings of the Talmud and the rabbis, *military service and illnesses* exempt from the law in general and from the prohibition on certain foods; secondly, the Talmud specifically allows, in certain cases, to use *fish and human blood mixed with food* (Talmud, book. IoreDeo, section 66, page 53), and says on this occasion as follows: "Blood of cattle, animals and birds is prohibited; fish blood is not prohibited, as long as it can be recognized by positive signs, for example, by scales, that it is really fish."

Human blood is also prohibited in its kind, because it cannot be distinguished from animal blood; therefore, human blood, left from the teeth on the crust of bread, must be scraped off; but the blood that happened in the mouth can be swallowed.

*In general, fish and human blood, as it is not prohibited by law, is allowed in any mixture with food.* In the book of *Sulkhan Orukh*, p. 42, art. 67, this is also clearly stated: "The blood of cattle and beasts cannot be used for food, but human blood, *for our benefit*, you can." The Jews claim that this refers to diseases, where blood was used in antiquity as a medicine; but in the commentary on the cited place it says precisely: "*Christians have long been warned, but we cannot do without blood, for what the book of Toisvus writes about.*" Further, p. 119, p. 193: "*do not make friends with a Christian where you need to ... so that they do not know about the shedding of blood.*" And here is an example of a pass in the Talmud, of course, more than just suspicious.

There are also verbal testimonies of baptized Jews about their sacrament of blood. So, for example, non-commissioned officer Savitsky, a baptized Jew, showed, on the occasion of an incident in the Grodno province in 1816, that Jews really use Christian blood and torture babies for this. According to him, this rite is performed in mid-April, on the feast of *Pesach*, i.e. by Easter; in memory of the slaughter of the lamb, the lintel is sprinkled with the baby's blood, or it is touched with a thread soaked in this blood. All this is in full agreement with the above information and testimonies, as well as with the circumstances of the former cases. Savitsky further showed: infants are taken mainly because they are easier to handle and easier to get; every Jew who succeeds in this is given remission of sins; to torture an infant, crucify him, and so on. there are detailed rules, and all this must be performed in the synagogue; but when there is a danger that the case might be made public through this, then it is allowed to kill a Christian, where and how possible, without observing any special rites; therefore, the barrel, in which it is ordered to roll the victim, to attract subcutaneous blood, has been canceled in modern times - and this was exactly what Rabbi Elijah, a Hasid, who was in Vilna, did. Savitsky asked only to protect him from the very dangerous persecution of the Jews, and in this case he undertook to discover everything; but his proposal was not accepted. He showed, among other things, that the Jews read the following prayer during the torture of an infant, from the book *Mangogima* (18) : "rejoice and be glad, that this blood will be drawn in eternal memory, not like this child, but like a fallen Kudr (Savior)". Then from Seider's book, *Olein's* prayer: "Christians worship idols, stone or wood, depicting Christ on them, but do not receive any help from Him. May His name perish, and may those who believe in Him perish, like dry grass and melting wax." The aforementioned Hasid wrote about this a very rare and highly secret book called *Zivuy*.

Private Fedorov, a baptized Jew, of the Life Guards of the Finnish Regiment, testified in 1830 about the trial of the Velizh case that, according to the well-known and secretly preserved teaching among the Jews, they really need Christian blood for the holiday of *Passover* (Easter), in unleavened bread; that his father, Fyodorov, told him about this, that he himself, as I am sure, used unleavened bread with this blood. Fedorov was exposed in some false testimony when he took it into his head to curry favor and explain the details of the Velizh case, which he knew only superficially; this, however, does not yet prove that his general testimony was also unfounded, especially if it agrees with all other information about this subject.

The baptized Jew Grudinsky testified the same about the same case. Many of his testimony turned out to be false; not less than that, however, he described with great detail and in accordance with other information the order and purpose of this fanatical rite. He claimed that there was a book of *Rambam contained in great secrecy*. (Gandoma tserihen dmey Akum selmytsves), in which the rite is described in full detail; that he himself saw and read this book and that on that copy were drawn, in the form of reinforcement or vignette, all the shells necessary to perform this inhuman rite; that for this the synagogue contains an iron crown, two iron spears, a knife for circumcision, a semicircular chisel for a grooved wound in the baby's side; barrel, in which it is rolled to attract subcutaneous blood, and describes with all the petty accuracy the appearance and special structure of this barrel, as only a person who has carefully examined the object can describe it. He also says that this barbaric rite changes somewhat when a girl is tortured, due to the lack of a boy; and this is also in accordance with the testimony of the soldier Terentyeva in the Velizh case. Grudinsky says, among other things, that girls should be rolled in a different barrel than boys, that this barrel is arranged differently; and Terentyeva, who herself was an accomplice to several such atrocities, shows precisely that the Jews tortured the girl in the same way, cutting off her nails and papillae on her chest, while Jewish circumcision was performed on the boy, but that *the girl was rocked in another, otherwise arranged barrel*. Grudinsky added one more, apparently insignificant, but in essence extremely important, circumstance: namely, that in remembrance of the betrayal of the Savior by Judas Iscariot, *an infant must be bought from a Christian for 30 pieces of silver*; but in case of need, it is allowed for the Jews

themselves to kidnap children and for that to transfer to Christians under some pretext, although at different times and in different hands, 30 coins.

This testimony is important because in almost all such cases, where the perverted Christians subsequently confessed themselves that they delivered a child to the Jews for money, it is precisely about *thirty* coins. So, in the Minsk case of 1833, Fekla Selezneva testified that the Jew Orko Sabunya promised her 30 rubles for a Christian child; Nikulsky (Złosc Zydowska, 1760, Lemberg) says that the Jews each contribute two zlotys, or 30 silver kopecks, for this blood and for the purchase of babies; Serafinowicz, mentioned above, confesses himself that he paid 30 chervonets each, and so on.

Grudinsky and others explain this frantic rite in this way: our Savior, according to the Jews, was not the son of God, but a man and worked miracles with black magic. By this means, he turned the Israelites, calling them raging, into a herd of pigs, drowning them in the lake; then the Christians eat pigs, though they know it is the blood of converted Israelites; and the Jews, to whom God commanded to crucify and torture Christ, now repeat this over His followers, quenching their revenge with their blood and committing their babies to the slaughter, instead of the Paschal lamb.

One of the most remarkable books on this subject is, without a doubt, the work of Abbé Chiarini, published in Paris in 1830 and dedicated to the Sovereign Emperor. Chiarini, with exemplary impartiality, analyzes the basic teachings of the Jews, proves that all the rules of the Talmud contain destructive teachings that do not recognize any societies other than Jewish, or even humanity itself or a person other than the Jewish one and the Jew. Chiarini exposes all the false wisdom, malicious fanaticism and intolerance of the teachings contained in the secret; he wrote his book with a lofty and noble goal: to investigate in all detail the real life and relations of the Jews and point out the means by which to bring this unfortunate people out of their disastrous position. Therefore, Chiarini does not show the slightest hatred for the Jews, but, confining himself to some scientific investigations, looks at this people with Christian humility. Not less than that, however, touching on the subject of this note, he says:

“A bloody, superstitious rite, which probably finds followers only in a small number of fanatics of the lower class of Jews, consists in luring Christian children by various means and sacrificing them during the Israeli holiday of Passover. Perhaps this is how the memory of the deicide committed by their forefathers is renewed, or the blood of babies is used for savage purposes, and, probably, both together. Raymond Martin states that this custom is based on the saying of the Talmud; but I find in the words he cites only one *permission* to secretly kill Christians, a permission that the savage people, of course, could explain in their own way. We see also in the word *covertly* a reservation or justification if this atrocity is not carried out; we also see that the Talmud in clear words commands the Jews to try to crush, upset Christians with something, before their solemn holidays, in order to distract them, Christians, from performing the rites of the church and not allow them to calmly enjoy the celebration sacred to them. Such a teaching, of course, can be interpreted by the Jews at will.” This passage of the Talmud, as Chiarini notes, has been distorted in the latest editions with the intent not to arouse suspicion among Christians. Then he continues: “to dispute that the Jews in many European lands, in their frenzy, performed this inhuman rite (the murder of Christian babies), would mean to delete from the pages of the annals several dozen events or cases that were described in all detail and proved with all thoroughness; it would mean destroying and destroying several monuments preserved by some cities, along with the tradition of this terrible crime; this would mean finally recognizing, without any reason for this, as perjurers people who are still alive and have seen with their own eyes, if not the very execution of the crime, then at least the undoubted attempts to do so. During the present year (1827) the Jews in Warsaw, as a joke, as they say, caught a Christian child and locked him in a chest [\(19\)](#) where it was found. But if we judge that this happened, as usual, a day or two before Easter, and that the Jews at the same time surrounded and provided themselves with all the precautions, according to the teachings of the Talmudists, then it will be too difficult to cover up such an action with the guise of a completely inappropriate joke.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs has an extract from the Jewish book *Etz-Chaim* (the tree of life) delivered in the 17th century by Rabbi Chaim Vytal, who lived in Poland, delivered by a well-known baptized Jew. On this occasion, the translator announced in writing that the custom of torturing Christian children, according to him, really exists among the Jews. This extract or translation in the thing itself serves as a complete proof of the contested issue; if the rabbi has already decided to write such a thing, without hesitation, in the book he published, then there is no doubt that there are no fanatics who, in their blindness, would not be ready to encroach on such inhuman villainy.

Here is the translation of this extract:

“Every animal preserves through life a certain particle of the holiness of the Most High.”



"A man, whoever he is, retains this holiness during his life more than an animal."

"When we kill (20) an animal, then the shadow of life departs from it, along with a certain particle of holiness, and turns in favor of the one who uses this animal for food; but while the shadow of life has not yet completely departed from the animal, then a certain particle of holiness that remains in it forbids us to use it. into food. So it is said in St. writings and about man, book. Number, ch. 14, art. 9: "They are our food; their shadow has departed from them." "This shows us by hints that since they no longer have that particle of holiness, they, like slaughtered animals or bread, are provided to us as food; therefore, the book is said. Number, ch. 23, art. 23: - *Cue* the people (the people of Israel) *will not sleep until they catch revenge and drink the blood of the slain*; and this alludes to people who do not keep in themselves holiness from above.

"From all this we conclude that by *killing and drinking the blood of a goy* (infidel) the *sanctity of Israel or the Jews is multiplied*."

This is what is written in the book of Etz-Chaim; and after such striking and indisputable evidence of the existence of such a frenzied rite among the Jews, one can only assert that the Jews for the most part do not follow these instructions, but it is impossible to deny their very existence.

Thus, we see that all the writers and baptized Jews who affirm the existence of this rite agree to speak about the purpose, meaning and order of its execution; and if it is further revealed below that in all cases where a crime was discovered and torture or obvious evidence and conscience compelled consciousness, this latter also fully agrees with the writers mentioned and with the general folk tradition, then it seems that the matter can be considered settled. What are the rhetorical cries of philanthropists and cosmopolitans, or the testimonies of a few educated and honest Jews who were not at all initiated into these mysteries, or the assurance of scientists that this would be contrary to the root laws of Moses, in comparison with these evidences and undeniable events? In this spirit there was a refutation or renunciation made publicly by the English Jews in Parliament; (21) with his comrades in his latest legal work: "Der neu Pitaval". All this can lead astray only those who are not briefly familiar with either the fanaticism of the inveterate Jews, or with the events and the judicial proceedings on them; but all this cannot make black white, and the past unheard of.

## FORMER CASES OF VILLAINOUS FANITY OF THE JEWS

Moving on then to the calculation of the former cases of the villainous fanaticism of the Jews and to the investigation of the most important of them, or at least those closest to us and therefore more reliable, taken from genuine office work and from various books written on this subject, we must first mention everything that already in the first centuries of Christianity, Jews carried the image of Haman on the cross in the streets as a mockery of Christians and repeatedly killed, out of spite, where they could, Christians (Church. East. Shrekka, vol. VII), and that in the Polish and Lithuanian laws of 1529 we find a special law for such a case: "When accusing a Jew of killing a Christian baby, three Christian witnesses must be presented; and whoever does not prove the accusations, he himself is subject to execution." (Chatsky, On the Lithuanian and Polish laws, vol. I, on the privileges of the Jews). Then:

### In the 4th century

1) Under Caesar Constantine, the Jews were expelled from some provinces for having crucified a Christian child on a cross on Good Friday.

### In the 5th century

2) In the code of Emperor Theodosius, Jews are forbidden to celebrate their memories by desecration of the likeness of the cross, which they solemnly burned; Theodosius also forbade the construction of synagogues in secluded places, in order to prevent various, repeatedly occurring, rampages; but the Jews, despite this, secretly crucified Christian babies, and several of them were executed for this, which happened in 419, in Syria, between Antioch and Chalcedon, in Pimistar (Eisenmenger. T. II. p. 220).

### In the 7th century

3) In the reign of Phocas, the Jews were expelled from Antioch because they killed, according to fanaticism, a reproachable death (22) of Bishop Anastasius and killed many Christians.

#### **In the 11th century**

4) In 1067 in Prague (in Bohemia) six Jews; sewn up in sacks and drowned in the river for having released blood from a three-year-old baby and sent it to other Jews, in Trevisa (Mostsky, ch. 25).

5) The relics of the Monk Eustratius, whose memory is celebrated on March 28, still rest in the Kyiv caves. In the Patericon there is his life and it is said that the saint was a resident of Kiev, taken prisoner by the Polovtsy, during the invasion of Khan Bonyak in 1096, sold to a Jew in Korsun, who subjected him to various torments and, finally, crucified him on the cross for his Easter feast, and then thrown into the sea. Here Russian Christians found his body and brought it to Kyiv (printed Pat. I. 169).

6) Between Koblenz and Bingen, on the Rhine, there is to this day a chapel with the relics of a child tortured to death by Jews in the 11th century; local Catholics venerate him as a saint.

#### **In the twelfth century**

7) In 1172, at Blois, France, the Jews crucified a child, put the corpse in a sack, and threw it into the river Loire (Centur, Magdeb. XII, Cap. XIV).

8) The same thing happened there in 1177, on the very day of Easter, and several Jews were burned at the stake for this. (Ibid. and Schleshek, ch. 9.)

9) In 1179, Jews were executed in Germany for having crucified a child on the cross (Dubravius, book 18).

10) In 1146, in Norwich (England), Jews were executed for crucifixion of the infant William on Good Friday. This case is described in full detail (ibid.; Vincencius, book 27).

11) In Brae (in France), the Jews bribed permission to execute a Christian, under the pretext that he was a robber and a murderer; they put an iron crown on him, flogged him with rods, and crucified him. (Ibid.)

12) The writers of former times, *Gegin* (23) and *Nauder*, testify in general terms that the Parisian Jews in the XII century abducted babies for Easter and betrayed them in cellars to martyrdom.

13) In Gloucester, during the reign of Henry II, the Jews crucified a Christian baby during Easter. (Ibid., Ch. XI, XIV.)

14) In 1179 in Prague (in Bohemia) many Jews were executed for a child tortured and crucified by them. (Hagel, sheet 304.)

15) Near Orleans (in France), in 1175, several rabbis were burned for killing a child, which they later threw into the water. In 1180 r. the Jews were expelled from France for such atrocities. (Tver (24) book 4.)

16) Around the same time, the same thing happened in Augsburg (in Germany), for which all the Jews were expelled from there.

17) In 1183, the Jews, who were sued for a similar atrocity committed on Great Friday, confessed to it, as well as to the fact that they were obliged to do this according to their faith. (Vincentius, book 29, ch. 25.)

#### **In the thirteenth century**

18) In 1288, in Becharatz (in Germany), the Jews tortured a child and put it under oppression in order to squeeze the blood out of him. (Shleshek, ch. 9).

19) In 1228, Jews in Augsburg crucified a child. (Ibid.).

20) In 1234 in Norwich, the Jews kidnapped a child, kept him secret for several months, until Easter, but did not have time to commit their atrocity; the child is found, and they are executed.

21) In 1250, in Arragonia, the Jews crucified their seven-year-old child during Easter. (Eisenm. Vol. II. p. 220).

22) In 1255, in Lincoln (England), Jews kidnapped an eight-year-old boy, flogged him with whips, crowned him with a crown of thorns, and crucified him on a cross. Mother found a corpse in a well; the Jews were exposed and confessed; one of them was torn to pieces by horses on the spot, and ninety were taken to London and executed there.

23) In 1257 in London, the Jews sacrificed a Christian baby on the Easter holiday (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 220).

24) In the village of Torhan (in Germany) in 1261, Jews released blood from all the veins from a seven-year-old girl, and threw the corpse into the river, where it was found by fishermen. The Jews were exposed and partly wheeled, partly hanged. (Shleshek, ch. 9).

25) In 1282, a woman sold a child stolen by her to the Jews, and they tortured him, puncturing him all over his body. When the same woman wanted to give them another child, she was caught, confessed to everything under torture, indicating the place where the first child was thrown: he was found stabbed all over the body; on this occasion there was an uprising in Munich, in which many Jews were killed. (Eisenm. T. II, R. 220).

26) In 1287, in Bern (Switzerland), several Jews were wheeled for killing a baby, and the rest were expelled. (Book of criminal proceedings against Jews).

27) In 1295, the Jews were expelled a second time from all over France for similar crimes.

#### **In the XIV century**

28) In Weissensee, in Turingia, in 1303, several Jews were burned for killing a noble child found in the water (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 221).

29) In 1305 in Prague, the Jews killed a Christian child on Easter. (Ibid.).

30) In Gublerlin (Germany) in 1331, the Jews crucified a child on the cross, for which they were all locked up in one Jewish house and burned. (Shleshek, ch. 9).

31) In Munich in 1345, a woman sold the child Heinrich to the Jews, who inflicted up to 60 wounds on him and crucified him on a cross. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 221).

32) In 1400, in Turingia, Jews bought a child from a Catholic and tortured him. Margraves Friedrich and Wilhelm ordered for this to be wheeled and quartered for the Catholic and the Jews. (Maemos, ch. 33).

#### **In the 15th century**

33) In 1401, in Swabia, the people rebelled over the killing by the Jews of two Christian children bought from some woman - they locked all the Jews with her in the synagogue and burned them alive there. (Maemos, l. 33).

34) In 1407 in Krakow, under King Jagiell, the people were indignant at the murder of a child by Jews, killed many Jews, devastated and burned their houses and drove them all out of the city. (Dlugosh, book X; Gembitsky, ch. 7).

35) In 1420, several Jews were executed in Venice for killing a baby on Good Friday. (Book of criminal proceedings against Jews for the murder of Christians).

36) In 1420, in Vienna, under Frederick, 300 Jews were burned for killing three children by them. (Maemos).

37) In 1454, several Jews were executed in Vienna for killing a child, taking out a heart, burning it into powder and drinking it in wine. This case is remarkable for the fact that our schismatics, the type of pliers, did the same, but they did not drink the powder themselves, but drugged others with it in order to attract them to their brotherhood by means of a spell.

38) In 1456, in Ancona, the baptized Rabbi Emanuel announced that a Jewish doctor who was there cut off the head of a Christian boy who served with him and carefully collected the blood.

39) He also showed about another similar case, where the Jews crucified a boy, stabbed him and collected blood in vessels.

40) In 1486, in Regensburg, six corpses of Christian babies were found in a Jewish cellar; during the study, a stone was immediately discovered, smeared with clay, under which traces of blood were found on the stone, because the children on it were killed. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 222).

41) In 1475 in Trient, in Tyrol.

42) In 1486 in Vratislav (Breslav).

43) In 1494 in Brandenburg, Jews were executed and partly burned for the murder of Christian babies.

The incident in Trient is described in full detail [\(25\)](#) . The three-year-old child Simeon was killed on Thursday on Holy Week, and the inhabitants worshiped him as a martyr. The Jew Tovi brought it to school; then they clamped his mouth shut, held his hands and feet, cut out a piece from his right cheek, pricked him with large needles all over his body, and, having collected his blood, they immediately put it in unleavened bread. The Jews cursed the child, calling him Jesus Christ, and threw the corpse into the water. The parents found the corpse and reported it to the authorities (John [\(26\)](#) Salisky and Citizen Brixen), who forced the Jews by torture to realize all the details of this villainy. They went to the grave of the baby to worship, and the martyr soon acquired the name of the righteous. Subsequently, Pope Sixtus IV opposed this and forbade even the persecution of the Jews of Triente, because, probably, the Jews managed to persuade people close to the pope in favor of their own; This incident was depicted in Frankfurt [\(27\)](#) in a picture that existed as early as 1700, with a detailed inscription, as the eyewitness Eisenmenger tells.

44) In 1492, the Jews, on similar charges, were expelled from Spain.

#### **In the 16th century**

45) In 1502, in Prague, a Jew was burned at the stake for killing a baby and bleeding from it. (Hagel, I. 122).

46) In 1509 in Bossingen (in Hungary), the Jews tortured a child that they had stolen from a chariot driver, and, having stabbed him all over the body, they let out blood, and threw the corpse out of the city. The perpetrators confessed under torture and were executed. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 222).

47) In 1510, the Jews were expelled from England, on the same charge.

48) Around the same time in Danzig, a Jew stole the son of a tradesman.

49) In Glozava, under King Augustus, the six-year-old boy Donemat and the seven-year-old girl Dorotta were tortured to death by the Jews.

50) In Rava, two Jews stole a child from a shoemaker and took his life, for which they were executed.

51) In 1540, in the Principality of Neuburg, the Jews brutally tortured a Christian baby, who lived for another three days. The case was revealed by the fact that a Jewish boy, playing with others in the street, said: "for three days this puppy howled and hardly [\(28\)](#) died." It was heard by strangers; and therefore, when the mutilated corpse was found in the forest by a shepherd's dog. And the people fled, they already knew who to take on. The blood of this martyr was found, by the way, in another city, in Posingen. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 223).

52 and 53) In 1566, in Narva and Belsk, the Jews were suspected of the same crime and managed to issue a special order on this from the Polish king Sigismund, who refuted this suspicion as absurd, and the king henceforth leaves such cases to his own court [\(29\)](#) .

54) In 1569 in Lenchitsy (in Poland), in the Volovsky monastery, the Jews tortured two babies.

55) In 1570, the Jews were expelled from the Margraviate of Brandenburg for swearing at the Holy Mysteries.

56.) In 1571, the Jews in Germany skinned a Christian named Bragadin and martyred him. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 219).



57) In 1574 in Lithuania, in the town of Pone, the Jews tortured one baby;

58) In 1589 in Vilna, on the outskirts - five [\(30\)](#) ;

59) In 1589, in Tarnow, in Globitsy, one, for which the guilty were executed by death.

60, 61 and 62) In 1590, in Olszowska Wola (in Poland), near Shidlovets, in Kurozvaki and Peterkovo, the Jews tortured three children.

63) In 1593, in the same place, a woman sold three children stolen by her to the Jews. [\(31\)](#)

64) In Krasnostavtsy, a student, or pupil of a school, was tortured in this way.

65). In 1597, in Shidlovets, the Jews sprinkled the school with the blood of a child they had tortured, which is recorded in the court books. This is in accordance with the Jewish rite to anoint the doors in their houses with the blood of the Paschal lamb, as well as with the above testimonies about this subject of a Jewish non-commissioned officer Savitsky and Pikulsky's testimony that Jews anoint the doors in the house of a Christian with this blood. It is also true that they not only eat the unleavened bread themselves with blood and sweet cakes made for the holiday of Purim, but also willingly treat the name of Christians.

66, 67 and 68) In 1598 in Lublin, in Kola and Kutna (in Poland), three babies were tortured to death by the Jews, about which there is a printed office work; the decree of the Lublin Tribunal is especially remarkable. The baby Albert was found in the forest near the village of Voznik, punctured and cut up. The Jews were exposed, but stubbornly shut themselves up; under torture, all five people, interrogated separately, showed the same thing, confessing to everything, and publicly repeated their testimony in court, and in the presence of Jews specially called for this. It was also for Easter. The Jew Yakhim testified that he did not participate in the murder, but accidentally saw the blood of a baby in a pot, and even tasted it, dipping his finger, believing that it was honey. Marco, a rich tenant with whom Yachim lived, and Mark's wife did not tell him to tell anyone about what he saw, but they did not reveal to him the secrets for which this blood was needed; Yahim, however,

Aaron confessed that he, along with Isaac, stole the baby when they were transporting malt, and handed it over to Zelman, who slaughtered him, collected blood and hired Nastasya, a worker, to carry the corpse into the forest. Aaron subsequently repeated his testimony several times, no longer recanting his words, but did not repent, but showed inveterate savagery, even when he found out about the death sentence.

Isaac also confessed, showed all the petty circumstances, according to Aaron, and added a disgusting, detailed picture of the torture and death of the martyr. According to him, the blood was distributed and used in unleavened bread.

Moshko, from Medzerzhitsa, showed exactly the same and explained the reason why the Jews do not bury tortured babies [\(32\)](#) , saying that this is contrary to their faith; it should be thrown away, not buried. This rule is in full agreement with what was said about this subject above, about the testimony of the baptized Rabbi Serafinowicz.

The worker Nastasya, a Christian, confessed to everything without torture; she added that the Jewess, her mistress, told her, taking out the corpse with her, that if they were to bury it, then all the Jews would die. Those responsible were executed [\(33\)](#) .

### **In the 17th century**

69) In 1601, in Chagrakh (in Poland), Jews killed a girl.

70) In 1606 in Lublin a boy.

71) In 1607 in Zvolyn (in Poland) a boy who was found in the water disfigured with cut off limbs.

72) In 1610, in Stashev (in Poland), the Jew Shmul stole a baby, sold him to Shchidlovets, where the Jews were captured at the very time when they were torturing their victim. The Jews are quartered, and the body of the baby is placed in a chapel, with the inscription: Filius Joharinis Koval et Susannae Nierychotovskiae, civium Staszowiensium, cujus vox sanguinis vindictum clamat ut Judei nominis Christiani hostes pellantur Stasovie; - That is: the son of Ivan

Koval and Susanna Nerikhotovskaya, citizens of Stashevsky, whose voice of bloody revenge calls for the expulsion of Jews from Stashev, enemies of the Christian name.

73) In 1616, on April 24, in Vilna, the Jew Brodavka killed the baby Jan, the son of the peasant landowner Olesnitsky.

74) In 1617, in Seltsy, near Lukovo, a baby tortured by Jews was found and placed in a college in Lublin.

75) In 1626 c. Sokhachev several Christian children were stolen and killed by the Jews.

76) In 1628, in Sendomir, the Jews tortured two children of a pharmacist.

77) In 1636, a decree of the Lublin tribunal followed in a similar case: the Jews, under some pretext, invited a Carmelite laik (novice) and, rushing at him suddenly, released a lot of blood from him and, threatening with death, obliged them with a terrible oath not to reveal what had happened. But as a result of this violence, the novice became desperately ill, confessed everything to the rector, and soon died himself, however, taking an oath in the justice of his testimony. On this basis, the Jews were executed.

78) In the Kalisz province, in the city of Lenchice, in the Bernardine church, there is still the corpse of a baby tortured by Jews. The descendants of the perpetrators for a long time were obliged to carry around the city, annually on the day of the crime, a picture depicting the Jews who participated in this, who were executed. Subsequently, this custom was brought out, and instead of paying a fine for the benefit of the monastery, the Jews were imposed.

79) In 1639 the child was tortured to death by the Jews in Komoshitsy.

80) In 1639, a similar incident happened in Lenchitsy, of which the original documents were still recently preserved [\(34\)](#), and an extract was made from them: the peasant Mendyk was seduced by the Jews and sold the child of the peasant Mikhalkovich to Rabbi Meyer. Having gathered at night, the Jews tortured the child in exactly the same way as happened in all such cases: they stabbed him all over his body and let blood out of him, and returned the corpse to the same peasant Mendyk. A reproach of conscience forced this man to denounce himself and the Jews; moreover, he testified that he had previously sold them two more guys. Mendyk confirmed the same under oath and on *double torture by fire, as well as on the frontal place, before execution*. Thus, Mendyk was quartered for consciousness; and the Jews, who stubbornly did not confess to anything, *were acquitted by the highest court*. This was one of the first and most remarkable lessons for Christians not to confess and not to convict the Jews of such a terrible villainy.

81) In 1648, in Ivanishki, the Jews tortured and stabbed a child, and covered the wounds with wax.

82) In 1650, on March 21, in Kadena, a Jew was wheeled for killing a child, inflicting eight rads on him and cutting off his fingers. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 223).

In 1649, the Jews tortured and killed babies:

83) In Khvostov;

84) In Kiy, near Pinchov;

85) In Negoslovitsy, near Vatsanov;

86) In Secimin;

87) In Opatov - and the guilty were executed,

88) In 1655, the same thing happened in Brezhnitsa, near Sendomir, where the tenant Tsiko was accused,

89) In Ostrov, near Lublin,

90) In the Sling.

91) In 1660, in Tunguch (Tunguch, in Germany), the Jews slaughtered a Christian child on Easter, for which up to 45 people were burned. (Eisenm. Vol. II, p. 223).

92) In 1669, near Metz (in France), the Jew Levi stole a child who was found dead in the forest; the culprit was burned. The details of this case are described in. booklet: Abrege du proces fait; aux Juifs de Mets, 1670.

93) On May 12, 1665, the Jews in Vienna martyred a woman who was found cut to pieces in a lake. Since such atrocities *were repeated* later, the Jews were expelled by the emperor in 1701 from Vienna. (Eisenm.-T. II, p. 220).

In 1689 there were similar incidents and the perpetrators were punished:

94) In Zhulkovo;

95) In Lemberg (Lviv);

96) In Tsekhanov;

97) In Drohobets. The judges assembled at this last place in this case were *all poisoned*.

98). In the Minsk province, near Slutsk, in the Holy Trinity Monastery, the relics of the infant Gabriel, who was tortured to death in 1690 by the Jews, will rest. The inscription tells all the details of this incident; the villainy was committed in Bialystok, the corpse was found in thick bread, with signs common in these cases. The dogs barked open the body of the baby, later recognized as a local saint. Prayer songs are composed in honor of him, known as troparion and kontakion. The Jew, Joke's tenant, was the main killer. Because of the fires, there are no monuments left about the court proceedings in this case.

99) In 1694, a child was killed by the Jews in Vladimir in Volhynia.

100) The same thing happened in 1697 in Novy Mesto, near Rava, and

101) In Vilna, where several Jews were executed for the martyrdom of babies. In 1698:

102) In the province of Brest, in Zabłudow;

103) In Kodna, under Zamosc;

104) In Sandomir;

.105) In Rozhany, and

106) In Slonim, the Jews tortured seven children; and in Brody they poisoned Bishop Tseseyka.

107) In Tsekhanovo and Belaya, in 1699, the Jews were executed in the square, in front of the synagogue, because, having drunk a young Christian man, they bled him and killed him [\(35\)](#) .

### **In the 18th century**

108, 109 and 110) In 1705 in Grodno, in Tseymeylev and Rzheshov, the Jews tortured three Christian children for Easter.

111) In 1750, the Jews were expelled from Kamianets-Podilsky due to the same incident.

112) In 1753, there was a case in Zhytomyr that was investigated in all details and proved by the investigation and the court; the very decision in this case was found in the archives in 1831.

On Good Friday, April 20, 1753, in the village of Markova Volnitsa, the Jews caught in the evening the three-year-old baby Stefan Studzitsky, took him to a tavern, gave him honey to drink and bread soaked in vodka, which caused the child to fall asleep and lie quietly behind the stove. On the night of Bright Sunday, the Jews gathered in a tavern, blindfolded the child, clamped his mouth with pincers, and, holding over the tub, pricked from all sides with sharp nails, shaking and lifting, for a better flow of blood. When the sufferer expired, the corpse was taken to the woods, where it was found the next day. According to obvious evidence, the Jewish women Breyna and Fruzha, without torture, confessed to this murder, and their husbands were caught by them and also confessed without torture. Then the others were tortured and, having obeyed, made such a detailed description of this villainous crime that, of course, there could

be no doubt. The Jews were executed by a cruel death in Zhytomyr: Rabbi Polodky and five other Jews were burned under the gallows with hands wrapped in resinous hemp, three straps were cut from the back, and then they were quartered, their heads were put on a stake, and the bodies were hung; five(36) others were simply quartered, their heads were impaled, their bodies were hung, one who received St. baptism, beheaded. At that time, a picture was painted depicting the corpse of the baby Studzitsky in the same form as it was found, punctured all over the body. The true picture is probably intact to this day; it was kept by the archbishop of Lvov.

113 and 114) In 1799, as seen from the files of the Department of Foreign Confessions [\(37\)](#) , there were two similar cases: 1) A dead man was found in the forest near Rezhitsa with unusual signs and wounds on his body: a wound was cut through as if with a chisel on the right hand; the other is higher than the left elbow; the third, similar, under the left calf and the fourth on the back. The wounds were clearly inflicted deliberately and in several steps; This man spent the night in a tavern with a Jew, whose worker took him out, in this position, into the forest. But the investigation did not reveal anything, because all the Jews taken into custody fled and were not found. 2) In the same year, before the Jewish Passover, in the Senninsk district, near the Jewish tavern, the corpse of a woman was found, stabbed in the face, on her arms and legs, and all over her body; but there was no trace of blood on the dress, from which it is clear that she was undressed, stabbed, deprived of life, and then washed and dressed. Investigation revealed nothing.

## In the 19th century

115) In 1805, a case was filed in the Velizh district court about the body of a twelve-year-old boy, Trofim Nikitin, found in the Dvina River; the boy was stabbed to death and punctured all over his body, for which three Jews were accused, including Chaim Cherny, who was caught a second time in the same case in 1823. Due to lack of evidence, the case is committed to the will of God; but subsequently, important omissions of the clerks were discovered, for which a fine was imposed on the zemstvo and district courts, but the case was not retried.

116) In 1811, before Easter, in the Vitebsk province, in the village of the landowner Tomashevskaya, a child from the cradle of a peasant disappeared, and although many circumstances led suspicion to the Jews, nothing was discovered by the investigation.

117) In 1816, in Grodno, on the eve of Easter, a peasant girl Adamovicheva was found as a victim, in whose one arm was cut out of the elbow joint, and her body was punctured in many places. Jews were suspected of this villainy, and the First Investigation reinforced the suspicion; but the Jews sent deputies to St. Petersburg, complaining about such an insulting suspicion for them and attributing it, very cunningly, to the hatred of the Poles for the adherence of the Jews to the government. As a result of this, the Highest Command of February 28 (announced on March 6), 1817, took place, "so that the Jews should not be accused of killing Christian children on the basis of one prejudice, that they need Christian blood, and what if a murder had happened somewhere and suspicion fell on the Jews - without prejudice, however, that they did this to obtain Christian blood, then an investigation would be carried out on a legal basis, etc." On this basis, the highest remark was made to the Grodno provincial authorities, and the case was dismissed. But at the insistence of the provincial prosecutor, who found irregularities and incompleteness in the initial investigation, it was resumed 10 years later: the State Council, having taken into consideration ten years ago and the Highest Command of 1817, by which it is forbidden to accept such suspicions of the Jews, decided: to betray the case this is oblivion. The baptized Jew Savitsky appeared on this occasion, volunteering to expose the Jews, if only he would be provided from the danger threatening him in this case; but the Council of State recognized that "this kind of research is prohibited by the aforementioned Highest Command." On this basis, the highest remark was made to the Grodno provincial authorities, and the case was dismissed. But at the insistence of the provincial prosecutor, who found irregularities and incompleteness in the initial investigation, it was resumed 10 years later: the State Council, having taken into consideration ten years ago and the Highest Command of 1817, by which it is forbidden to accept such suspicions of the Jews, decided: to betray the case this is oblivion. The baptized Jew Savitsky appeared on this occasion, volunteering to expose the Jews, if only he would be provided from the danger threatening him in this case; but the Council of State recognized that "this kind of research is prohibited by the aforementioned



Highest Command." it was renewed 10 years later: the State Council, having taken into consideration ten years ago and the Highest Command of 1817, by which it is forbidden to accept such suspicions about the Jews, decided: to consign this matter to oblivion. The baptized Jew Savitsky appeared on this occasion, volunteering to expose the Jews, if only he would be provided from the danger threatening him in this case; but the Council of State recognized that "this kind of research is prohibited by the aforementioned Highest Command." it was renewed 10 years later: the State Council, having taken into consideration ten years ago and the Highest Command of 1817, by which it is forbidden to accept such suspicions about the Jews, decided: to consign this matter to oblivion. The baptized Jew Savitsky appeared on this occasion, volunteering to expose the Jews, if only he would be provided from the danger threatening him in this case; but the Council of State recognized that "this kind of research is prohibited by the aforementioned Highest Command."

118) (38) In 1821, on the banks of the Dvina River, the body of Christina Slepovronskaya was found, and the Jews were suspected of her murder, although nothing was discovered.

119) In 1821, on the eve of Easter, in the Mogilev province, Chausovsky district, in the village of Golenyakh, the dead body of the boy Lazarev was found, about which, by outward signs, it was judged that he should be killed by savage Jews. The governor began a strict investigation, but the Jews, having again sent deputies to St. Petersburg, with a letter from the district attorney exposing him of intent to abuse, complained about such an insulting suspicion for them, contrary to the Highest Command of 1817. The case was dismissed, and a reprimand was made to the provincial government for acting contrary to the aforementioned Highest Command, accepting such a suspicion of the Jews.

120) In 1823 pastor Ertel made public a similar case in Bavaria. This is perhaps the last example in Western Europe. Since then, such incidents have been publicized only in Poland, in our western provinces and in the East, in Turkey, Syria, and so on. (Was glauben die Judeh? vom Pfarrer Oertel, Bamberg, 1823).

121) In 1823, a similar incident happened in Velizh, Vitebsk province, one of the most remarkable cases, in terms of the hugeness of production, intricacies, a large number of touchy ones, in terms of other similar atrocities discovered on this occasion, in duration, and finally because it went back to the final decision is up to the State Council. There is such accurate and complete information about this case that it deserves special attention, which is why it will be discussed in more detail below.

In connection with the trial of the Velizh case, several more similar atrocities were discovered, but in all these cases, decided at one time, the evidence and evidence were found to be insufficient. This included:

122) Murder in Velizh of two peasant boys, in 1817. The first statement about this was made by the worker Terentyev, who herself brought, for money, the boys to the house of the Jew Tsetlin. The workers Maximova and Kovaleva, who also participated in this case, confessed and confirmed the testimony of the first in everything; and Kovaleva, being a serf of the wealthy Jews of Berlin, who bought an entire estate in the name of the county treasurer Sushka, was so frightened of her confession that, after crying all night and claiming that she had now disappeared, she strangled herself. According to the testimony of these women, the Jews cut off the nails of the boys, then cut them off, rocked them in a barrel, tied their legs under the knees with a strap, pricked them all over the body, collecting the outflowing blood, and the dead were thrown from the pier into the Dvina River. The testimonies of these three women, in spite of their confusion, are worn, in its disgusting details, the imprint of the irrefutable truth. So, for example, Kovaleva, in tears and in fear, told where and on what occasion she saw, in a special chest at Tsetlina, dry blood cakes from the blood of these boys, and - part of the blood collected in a silver glass, adding that the blood had already spoiled and smelled like dead meat.

123) She, Kovaleva, announced on this occasion that, in all likelihood, the same Jews killed her own brother, Yakov, but that she did not dare to talk about it. According to the certificate, it turned out that the minor, Yakov, died in 1818, as if from a wound inflicted on himself by negligence; This matter, due to prescription, was left without attention.

124) In the same case, it was discovered that the same Velizh Jews in 1817 tortured and killed the noblewoman Dvorzhitskaya, an adult woman, whose remains were found in the forest the following year. And the same two depraved Russian women participated in this villainy and revealed all the petty details of it. They made Dvorzhitskaya drunk, rocked her in a barrel, beat her on the cheeks, swore at her, put her on two chairs, stabbed her in different places, and collected the blood in a substituted dish; they washed the dead one, put it in a chapel, and took it outside the city, into the forest. From this incident, by the way, it is clear that the Jews, infringing on such a thing, are not limited to killing

only babies or men, but are ready to take advantage of every opportunity to [\(39\)](#)kill a Christian and take his blood for superstitious rites. However, Terentyeva just showed that she did not know where the Jews had used Dvorzhitskaya's blood; but she noticed that they, examining this blood, found it black and were dissatisfied with it.

125) In the same case, the following was discovered: the murder by Jews of two girls, beggars, in 1819 in Semichevoka tavern near Velizh. And here the outrageous details, in everything consistent with the circumstances and with other information about similar cases, leave no doubt about the truth of the incident. Many Jews, who were slandered in this case, were exposed in completely false testimonies and impudent lies; so, by the way, they assured that they did not know at all and never saw Terentyeva, while it was proved that they knew her very briefly and for many years, because she served as a worker for the Jews in the same place.

126) In the same case, the murder of four more children in the Brusovanovskaya tavern was discovered. This also happened before Easter, in 1821 or 1822, during the time of famine, when children were walking around the world, and the Jews, calling them to the tavern, locked them up separately, and then they killed them one by one, in the presence of many other Jews, in the usual martyrdom. The accomplices of the Jews, Maksimova and Terentiev, named most of the perpetrators by name, describing in detail how the crime was committed, who stood where, what he said and did. One Jew was driven by the evidence to the point that, getting in the way and at a loss, sobbing, he said in the presence of the commission: "If someone from my family confesses, or someone else says all this, then I will confess." Other Jews either remained stubbornly silent, or lost their temper and shouted furiously and threatened the witnesses.

To all this was added a special case of the desecration by the Jews of the Holy Mysteries, received under the cup, and the antimension, stolen on purpose from the church for this.

The search showed the justice of this denunciation, revealing all the details of it; Nevertheless, the Jews did not consider it necessary to confess, and really got off with an unfounded, stubborn denial. During interrogations in the presence of Jews, they lost their temper, shouted and cursed to the point that they were taken out, and the commission could not continue interrogations. This case, however, is mentioned here only in connection with the previous ones.

127) In 1827, before Easter, in the Vilna province in the Telshevsky district, the village of the landowner, Dammi, the seven-year-old child Piotrovich went missing. Shepherd Zhukovsky announced that he himself saw how the Jews caught the child in the field and took him away;

the corpse is found subsequently mutilated in exactly the same way as in all similar cases; the Jews got confused during interrogations, made false testimonies, again they were canceled, and finally they were convicted of this atrocity as much as it is possible to convict people who have nothing to justify their own, except for unfounded denials. Despite the fact that in this case there was even one outside witness, the aforementioned shepherd, the Jews were left only in suspicion. And this, of course, already proves that all the evidence, except for consciousness, was present, because in all other contemporary cases, placed above and below, the Jews were always acquitted. To this must also be added that two Jews, who began to confess, were found dead: one killed, under the bridge, the other poisoned. Here it will be appropriate to mention that on the occasion of such a production, which now could not be found, a Jew who confessed to a crime was found hanged in a Jewish school, behind closed doors; Despite this, the testimony of the Jews that he strangled himself was accepted.

128) In 1827, a child disappeared in Warsaw two days before Easter; Obviously, suspicion fell on the Jews, the traces were opened, and the child, contrary to the assurances and denial of the owner of the house of the Jew, was found in his chest. Despite many circumstances blatantly denouncing those responsible for the fact that they intended to sacrifice the child in the usual way to their frenzied fanaticism, the Jews escaped with the assurance that they did this for a joke. (Chiarini, fl. II).

129) In the book *Journey through Turkey by the Englishman Valiya*, 1828, it says the following:

"Christians of Constantinople claim that the Jews, abducting children, sacrifice them for Easter, instead of the Easter lamb. I witnessed great unrest among the residents. A Greek merchant's child was missing, and it was thought that he had been stolen and sold into slavery. But soon his body was found in the Bosphorus; his hands and feet were tied, and the special wounds and marks on his body showed that he had been killed in an unusual way, with some special inexplicable intention. Public accusations fell on the Jews, because it happened before Easter; but nothing was revealed."

130) In 1833, in the Minsk province of Borisov district, the Jew Orko, who lived in the village of Plitchanakh, lured the peasant woman Fekla Selezneva, who had left the landowner, and the 12-year-old girl Efrosinya with her, and, according to the testimony of the first, persuaded her, promising 30 rubles for this (40), agree to kill the latter in order to extract blood from her. The corpse was found, and on it, in addition to signs of strangulation, a wound on the temple, from where, according to Fekla, Orko bled blood into a bottle. He told her that he needed this blood for some pregnant relative, who needs Christian blood during childbirth, to anoint the eyes of the child. manage." In the house of a Jew, and partly even on his wife and daughter, a dress removed from the murdered woman was found; Thekla, after denial and contradiction, told all the details of this murder and how Orko poured blood into a bottle. Subsequently, the Jews were convicted of bribing the defendant Thekla so that she would take everything on herself and not betray the Jews. Orko also persuaded the mother of the murdered woman, so that she does not look for her daughter, who lives in a good place; he, by force and fight, did not allow the barn to be searched, where, at the direction of Fekla, the corpse was found. Orka's wife and daughter and he himself were constantly confused in false testimony. As a result of all this, Orko was charged with murder; but, on the basis of the Supreme Command of 1817, which prohibited the suspicion of the use of Christian blood by Jews, this issue was eliminated.

131) Volyn province in the Zaslavsky district, the following happened in 1833:

Prokop Kazan, a peasant of Count Grokholsky, appeared on March 20 at the Economic Board and announced by signs that on the way to the village of Volkovtsy three Jews attacked him and cut off his tongue. When the wound healed, he told the following:

"I was overtaken by the Jews when I crossed the forest, at the crossroads between the villages of Gorodishche and Seredintsy. Coming up with me, at first one Jew came up to me and, talking, walked beside me; then another joined us, and finally a third. Suspecting nothing, I nonchalantly answered their questions, when suddenly one of them, lagging behind a little, grabbed me from behind and threw me down; others rushed in and began to crush my chest and choke me by the throat, so hard that I went unconscious and probably stuck out my tongue. Coming to my senses from pain, I saw myself kneeling with my head bowed; one Jew supported my head, and another put a cup under my mouth, into which blood was pouring heavily. In this position, constantly pushing me in the sides and back of the head, probably to increase the bleeding, they kept me until the cup was filled with more blood, than half. Then, taking a bowl of blood and taking from me 12 silver rubles that I found at the fair, they got into their britzka and left. It happened around noon. From the outflow of blood, I again fainted, and when I came to myself, the sun was already low. The Jews left in a britzka with three bay and one white horses."

The Zaslavsky mayor immediately gathered all the Furman Jews there, placed them in two rows and, calling Kazan, ordered him to recognize the criminals among them. Kazan walked three times through the rows and, still unable to speak, showed with signs that they were not here. Having checked the cash Jews according to the list, the mayor found that three of them were missing, namely: Itsk Malach, Shay Schopnik and Helm Kaliya. They were called up, placed in the ranks, and Kazan, who had already been released, was called again. As soon as he approached, he immediately pointed to Itzka Malach, trying in every possible way to let know that this was the one who cut off his tongue; in Shopnik he recognized the one who held him; in Kaliya found a resemblance to the third participant in the crime, without asserting, however, positively that it was him. Kazan stood firm in his testimony, even after spiritual exhortation.

The Jews were locked up. Malach assured that he had not left the city for ten days; Shopnik, that he went and returned exactly on the 20th, but with the Jew Reznik, and on the same horse; Potassium, which was also in the city at that time. Each presented witnesses.

Potassium's testimony appears to have been confirmed; Schopnik's words are partly the same, but with some inconsistency regarding time; of the witnesses presented by Malach, two Jews, including his owner Girshtel, refused to testify at all; and only one Jew, one Jewess, a janitor and his father, an ordinary disabled team, a man punished for bad behavior with a gauntlet and transferred to the disabled and, moreover, who was on guard at Malach, confirmed his testimony.

Meanwhile, the inhabitants of the villages adjacent to the place where the incident happened were questioned. Many of them testified that they had seen three Jews that day (41), but they did not notice where they were going, they do not remember either the color or the number of their horses; Still others showed that the Jews really rode on similar horses, but did not notice how many people there were and where they went; one announced that he saw precisely three Jews

passing through the village of Gorodishche on three bay and one white horse; and the Zaslavl police official positively certified that only the Jew Malakh rode out of the city on three bay and one white horses, and that at that time no other Zaslavian Jew had such a carriage or horses. He could only say positively whether Malach went somewhere on the very day of the incident.

The medical council, which testified to Kazan, found that the tongue was cut off with a really sharp instrument, but that this was done forcibly, the council recognized it as impossible; firstly, due to the impossibility of three people to commit such violence, and secondly, because Kazan has none. body, not on the dress, except for the lower one, on which, according to him, he wiped himself, when he came to his senses, there was no blood anywhere, which would have been impossible to avoid with violence.

The master of Novogradvolynsk decided: to leave the Jews in strong suspicion.

The Criminal Chamber decided to leave them free.

The governor gave the opinion that he considers the Jew Malach convicted and supposes to exile him to Siberia; Shopnik left in suspicion and transferred to live in another city; Kaliya subjected to police supervision at the place of residence.

The Governing Senate, based on: 1) the conclusion of the medical council; 2) on the evidence of the Jews about their being at the time of the incident without a break in the city, except for Shopnik, who proved that he traveled with Reznik; 3) on the general approval of the behavior of the Jews; 4) on the fact that Kazan a) did not immediately announce the 12 rubles he found, b) went to taverns and drank, c) deceived his brother, hiding the real reason for his leaving home, and therefore, despite the approval of outsiders, with bad side showed his behavior - decided: 1) to recognize the Jews as inviolable to the case, 2) Kazan, for a false slander of them, *punish them with twenty lashes* and leave them under police supervision, in suspicion that he himself mutilated himself from criminal species.

It is impossible to refrain from some remarks here. And, in the first place, either the administration itself, due to its simplicity, was deceived, or, which is much more likely, deceived others. Her testimony, in any case, is false, unfounded. If three people knock one down and choke him by the throat, pressing down on his chest, to unconsciousness, then not only will his mouth open, but even his tongue will stick out, one has only to press down on his Adam's apple or larynx. It is no less clear why Kazan did not have blood on his clothes: he woke up from the first faint, kneeling, with his head bowed forward, over the dishes, and three (42) the Jews were holding him; soon he again fainted and lay, having lost a lot of blood, from noon until evening. So, at first the blood ran into a cup placed right up to his mouth, then, for the duration of the fainting spell, it stopped, caked on his tongue, and when he came to his senses for the second time, there was no more bleeding, and therefore the dress was not bloody.

132) In 1840, during Easter, the Catholic priest Father Thomas, who lived in Damascus, went with his minister to the Jewish quarter, and both disappeared without a trace. The accusations fell on the Jews; the entire Christian population of Damascus rose up, and indignation inflamed even the Muslims. The French consul, fully convinced that the atrocity was committed by the Jews, sought out himself, urged the Turkish government to action by all means, and insisted on accusing and executing the Jews; the Austrian consul, to whose department the Jews partly belonged, opposed and defended the Jews. Terrible torture forced out of these last consciousness in all the details of villainy; several people could not even survive the inhuman torments, and therefore now in Europe they say that their consciousness was forced and false (43). But this consciousness is the same in all its details, in the interrogations of several Jews, and, moreover, the remains of the master and his servant cut into pieces were found in different places, at the direction of these Jews, and, by the way, a part of the hat or beret of the deceased was found there, and that's all. those who knew him immediately recognized his rags. Jewish embassies with gifts, from Paris and London to Alexandria, stopped the case, and the Jews who survived were released (44) .

133) In the current year of 1844, the highest court of the Porte pronounced a decision on the charge of the Jews living on the island of Marmara, in the martyrdom of a Christian baby, who was found tormented, as in all similar cases. The complaint was brought by the Greek patriarch, but at the insistent intercession of the English envoy, as it was said in the newspapers (45) , the Port did not find the Jews guilty, but sentenced the patriarch to pay the protorei.

134) In April 1843, also before Easter, we again had a wonderful incident of this kind in Russia, although not so much villainous, because it did not involve murder. In the Vitebsk province, in the city of Lutsk, two Jews, the brothers Berko

and Shmaria Klepachi, seized the fifteen-year-old girl Shcherbinskaya and forced her to bleed, collecting blood in a glass. Despite all the evidence, Berko and Shmaria denied everything and could not be caught, because there were no witnesses, nor brought to consciousness. The governor-general therefore tried to collect secret information on the spot and found that although this information is insufficient for a positive conclusion, it reinforces the long-standing belief that Jews use Christian blood for some fanatical rites.

## THE VELIZH CASE

In concluding with this a number of examples selected from various books and cases, which serve as proof of the existence among Jews of such a rite, which often leads to the murder of Christians, and especially babies, we must also take into account that the examples given, although there are many of them, of course, constitute a small only a part of really former cases, because far from all of them were discovered, not all of them were preserved in written monuments, and, finally, far from all could be collected: all such cases ended in proceedings in lower and middle places could not be included, because that there was no information about them here; likewise, those cases in which nothing is discovered at all, and all information about them is limited to testimony in the statements [\(46\)](#) about incidents where a child went missing. But in order to positively ascertain that this accusation is not slander or fiction, and that more than one torture of the Middle Ages extorted this terrible consciousness from the Jews, it remains to examine somewhat closer one of the newest cases of this kind, for example, the Velizh case, which began on April 24th.

1823 in the Velizh city police and finished on January 18, 1835, twelve years later, in the general meeting of the State Council. This case is remarkable for its great details, its many times renewed searches and the clarity of all the evidence, not even excluding the own consciousness of some, although not quite pronounced. But what could make the Jews confess to such a crime, constituting a religious, fanatical secret, and what could the criminals expect from this? On the contrary, stubborn, insolent, unfounded denial almost always saved them, and saved them this time as well.

On April 22, 1823, the soldier's son Fyodor Yemelyanov, 3.5 years old, went missing in Velizh. It was on the very day of the Holy Resurrection of Christ. The corpse of the boy was found on St. Thomas Week outside the city, in the forest, in such a form that no one from the inhabitants could doubt the truth of the suspicion that had arisen and the deaf rumors that had spread, through some kind of divination, namely, that the boy had been brutally tortured by the Jews. All over the body there were skin abrasions, as if the skin had been rubbed hard with something; the nails were cut down to the body; all over the body there are many small wounds, as if pierced by a nail; blue, bloody legs proved that a strong bandage had been placed under the knees; the nose and lips are flattened, also from the former bandage, which even left a purple mark on the back of the head, from the knot; and, finally, Jewish circumcision was performed on the boy. All this proved indisputably, as the doctor said under oath, that the child was tortured with intent, judicious; but from the condition of the entrails it was evident that he had been kept for several days without food. The crime was committed, moreover, on a naked child, and the body was subsequently washed and dressed; for there was no sign of blood on the linen and dress. From the tracks and ruts near the place where the corpse lay, it was clear that a pair of wagons or chaises drove up from the road to this place, and the corpse was taken from there to the swamp on foot. Suspicion was declared by parents and other people on the Jews, and no one could think of another reason for the martyrdom of an innocent baby. The crime was committed, moreover, on a naked child, and the body was subsequently washed and dressed; for there was no sign of blood on the linen and dress. From the tracks and ruts near the place where the corpse lay, it was clear that a pair of wagons or chaises drove up from the road to this place, and the corpse was taken from there to the swamp on foot. Suspicion was declared by parents and other people on the Jews, and no one could think of another reason for the martyrdom of an innocent baby. The crime was committed, moreover, on a naked child, and the body was subsequently washed and dressed; for there was no sign of blood on the linen and dress. From the tracks and ruts near the place where the corpse lay, it was clear that a pair of wagons or chaises drove up from the road to this place, and the corpse was taken from there to the swamp on foot. Suspicion was declared by parents and other people on the Jews, and no one could think of another reason for the martyrdom of an innocent baby.

Meanwhile, it turned out that the soldier Marya Terentyeva, even before the corpse was found, was telling fortunes and announced to her mother that her son was still alive, was sitting in the cellar of the Jews of Berlin and would be tortured to death at night; the same was predicted by the twelve-year-old girl Anna Eremeeva, a sick woman who was dying and was famous among the People for foretelling. A search was made at the Berlins' house, but nothing suspicious was found; the owner announced that he had no cellar in his house; but there were two of them, although this find did not



serve anything; the examination was carried out by one quarter warden with a ratman, firstly, a Jew, and, secondly, a close relative of the Berlins, in whose house the boy was hidden during the search.

Shmerka Berlin was a merchant, a very wealthy man, honorable among the Jews and lived well; his mother-in-law Mirka was also reputed to be rich, and this house was a large, prosperous family. The Berlins even owned the inhabited estate *Krasnoy* and serfs bought in the name of the county treasurer Sushka . The closest relatives of the Berlins were the Aronsonovs and Tsetlins, and then many other families in Velizh, Vitebsk and other neighboring cities.

Seven women testified under oath that early in the morning on the same day when the body was found, they saw a pair of Jewish britzka galloping at full speed along the road where the body was found, and soon returning back to the city; and one witness affirmed positively that Iosel, the clerk of Berlin, was sitting in the britzka with another Jew. The Berlins, their clerk, and the coachman claimed that they had not gone anywhere and that they did not even have a forged britzka; but it turned out that Yosel had definitely come to Berlin himself at that time in a forged britzka, which stood in the latter's yard. But two ratmans, Jews, including Tsetlin himself, trying to avert suspicion, with a huge crowd of Jews broke into the yard where the visiting priest had landed, began to measure the width of the wheels and claimed that he had run over the boy, while Orlik and other Jews spread the rumor that the child had definitely been moved,

The investigators did not discover anything else, did not pay attention to an extremely important circumstance; to the preliminary announcement of two women, Terentyeva and Yeremeyeva, that the boy was in the hands of the Jews, and even of the Berlins, and that he would soon die. One of them, Terentyeva, was in Velizh itself, the other, Yeremeyeva, in Sentyury, twelve versts from the city. This mysterious prediction was bound to give the key to all searches, because it clearly and undoubtedly proved the relevance of the named two persons to the incident itself. The case was referred to the Velizh district court, which concluded on June 16, 1824: "due to lack of evidence, the Jews should be released from the charge of killing the boy; but leave Hanna Zetlin and Iosel in suspicion, and accuse Shmerka of Berlin and his comrades of spreading false rumors about the death of the boy, *which is probably ruined by the Jews!*"

On November 22, the Supreme Court agreed with this decision, adding, however, that since the child *was obviously killed intentionally*, then try to uncover the culprits. The governor approved the decision, and the case is over.

But in 1825, during the passage of the blessed memory of the Sovereign Emperor Alexander 1st ([47](#)) through Velizh, the soldier Terentyeva submitted a request to His Majesty, in which she called the boy Fyodor Emelyanov her son and complained that he had been killed by the Jews. On this occasion, the case was resumed, the investigation was first entrusted to a special official, under the supervision of the governor-general; then an aide-de-camp was sent by the highest order, after Major General Shkurin, a whole commission of inquiry was drawn up, in the end a chief prosecutor was sent from the Senate and ordered to bring the case directly to the Governing Senate. Already extensive and extremely complicated in itself, it became even more complicated when six or seven other similar cases were revealed on this occasion: about the theft of the antimension; about the desecration by the Jews of him and of the Holy Mysteries; about the conversion of three Christians to the Jewish faith and about the killing of several more babies. The veil was torn off a whole series of the most terrible crimes, the offspring of unheard-of savagery and the consequences of disastrous impunity. But here it is supposed to trace only one of them, most importantly, about the soldier's son Yemelyanov.

The Berlins had a worker, *Praskovya Pilenkova* (later Kozlovskaya by her husband); at the Tsetlins *Avdotya Maksimova*, at the Aronsonovs *Marya Kovaleva*, all three are Christians, but settled down with the Jews and accustomed to their way of life, customs and rituals. Kozlovskaya was still very young at the time of the incident, and soon afterwards she married a gentry; Kovaleva was from childhood the unrequited serf of the Aronsonovs, who, as she later showed, did not even dare to announce her very well-founded suspicion that her masters had killed her own brother. Maksimova was a determined and depraved woman and a faithful servant of the Jews for money and wine. Marya Terentyeva, a peasant woman or soldier, of dissolute behavior, also served in Velizh, here and there, among the Jews, and partly only served from time to time and, ready for anything, like Maksimova, for money and vodka, has long been their main assistant with all vile and evil deeds.

Terentyeva, during the new investigation, first testified that she saw how Hanna Tsetlin brought a child home from the street on the Bright Resurrection of Christ, that she followed Hanna, who gave her wine to drink; that in the evening they told her to take the child along with Maximova to the Berlins, where Mirka put him in the cellar; on Thursday at the Saint she had already seen the boy. dead, and his blood stood in a new trough; the Jews washed and dressed the corpse, and Khanna instructed her, Terentyeva, on Fomin Monday to carry the boy, together with Maximova, into the

forest at night, which they did. She was interrogated many times over the course of several months, persuaded, exhorted, and at first she confessed that she herself was with the Berlins, together with Maximova and Kozlovskaya, when they tortured and tortured the child; then, that she herself brought him, at the relentless request of the Jews, to the Tsetlins; that after they transferred him to the Berlin, and there on Monday they tortured me; they undressed him, put him in a barrel, rolled him, laid him on a table, cut his nails, made a circumcision, tied his legs under his knees with straps; put in a trough (48); all the Jews pricked the boy with a nail, bled him out and handed him over to Terentyeva and Maksimova to throw him into the forest; but, as the sufferer was still breathing, they tied his mouth and nose, and when they carried him out, they removed the handkerchief and saw that the child had already died and laid him where he was found.

Then Terentyeva, as three years had already passed since the incident, and, moreover, she often drank, said that she had made a mistake in some details, and now she remembered that it was not a Jewish Settled who cut the child's nails, who did the circumcision (49), and Shifra Berlin; that she herself took the boy out of the barrel and carried him to the Jewish school; that she was forced to bandage his feet and prick him with a nail; that, finally, she and Maksimova were dressed in Jewish clothes and ordered to carry the corpse into the swamp. Then the next day she was again with the Jews at the school, blabbing and spilling, on their orders, the blood of the martyr, and in the remainder she wetted a piece of canvas, which the Jew Orlik cut into shreds and distributed to everyone piece by piece. She took the keg of blood to a corner house with a green roof. Again, on another occasion, she testified that she did not bring the child to Mirka, but to the room of her daughter, Slavka, in the same house; that he was kept not in a cellar, but in a closet; that all the Jews rolled the barrel for a long time, changing in pairs; that she, Terentyeva, carried a barrel of dried blood, at the insistence of the Jews, to Vitebsk. The Jews went with her, whom she named by name and it was obvious that, following their general rule in all such cases, this time they also used a Christian woman and, moreover, a drunken, dissolute woman, as a dummy criminal, imposing a keg of blood on her hands so that in case of trouble she would renounce from him and leave her alone to blame. In Vitebsk they stopped at the Zhids of such and such years and will accept; they dissolved the blood in water and soaked the canvas, poured the rest into bottles, gave gifts and gave Terentyev to drink, and sent one bottle of blood with her to the town of Lezna. Here also the canvas was wetted, cut and divided. Terentyeva added that the Jews, by flattery and threats that she would be exiled to Siberia for the murder of a boy, forced her to accept the Jewish faith and described the whole rite of conversion in detail; by the way, they put her on a hot frying pan, forcing her to swear, they clamped her mouth, not to scream and hold; then they bandaged the burnt soles with ointment.

Soldier *Avdotya Maksimova*, The Tsetlins' worker, during the interrogation, which lasted almost a whole year, testified at different times: that she had seen the child on Monday in Holy Week at her mistress's in the corner behind the bed; on Wednesday I saw him in the closet, in a chest, from which everything edible was put on the floor for this; further she confessed that Hanna Tsetlin brought the boy to the yard, and she, Maksimova, herself brought him into the room, then Terentyeva took him to Mirka Berlin; in this way they carried it, hiding it, back and forth several times. On Monday on Fomina she saw him dead in Mirka's cellar; at night, Yosel and another Jew took him in a chaise to the Tsetlins; Maximova was ordered to wash him, dress him, and take him out of the city together with the Jews. At a confrontation with Terentyeva, Maksimova confessed, however, to everything and confirmed all the details of her testimony. It was obvious that both women discovering the crime and its main culprits, they first wanted to stay away themselves; this is what resulted from their heterogeneity and their initial incomplete testimony. She testified that when ratman Tsetlin, Hanna's husband, searched the house of Berlin with the quarter, the Jews laughed, because the child was at that time in the house of ratman Tsetlin himself; that she, Maksimova, was forced to accept the Jewish faith, having drunk drunk and so on. She told the whole ceremony in detail at the school where she was named Risa, and added that since the murder of the boy she had full power in the Tsetlins' house, who were afraid of her, pleased her, gave her water and food well and begged with tears if she frightened, who wants to go somewhere else. This circumstance was also confirmed by Maximova's daughter, Melanya, saying that since 1823, not the hostess, but Melanya's mother was the eldest in the house. This was also confirmed under oath by third-party witnesses who heard more than once how Maksimova, drunk, boasted that "Tsetlina does not dare to exile her from the court, even if she wanted to, because she, Maksimova, knows such a thing that will destroy Hanna." Convicted of this, Hanna confessed that Maksimova definitely made such speeches, "although I she does not understand why she said this."

*Praskovya Kozlovskaya* (Pilenkova), a worker of the Berlins, testified: on the night of the first day of Easter, there was a secret meeting of Jews at Slavka Berlin (daughter of Mirka); on Wednesday she saw a boy crying in the hallway. At a confrontation with the first, she confessed and testified that the boy had been carried back and forth to the Berlins and Tsetlins; that Terentyeva and Maksimova were at the night gatherings, but she, Kozlovskaya, was not; she was sent on

Monday evening to the drinking office; going up to the shutter, from outside she saw through the crack a barrel, a boy and Jews, she saw who was undressing him, putting him to bed, cutting his nails, and so on. Then the boy was carried to school, and she hid, followed him and through the window of the school saw how he was stabbed, wrapped in a trough, taken out, washed, dressed; Terentyeva and Maksimova, dressed in a Jewish dress, took the boy and carried him out of school, and she, Kozlovskaya, ran away. She then confessed that she was afraid to tell the truth and wanted to eliminate herself, but that she definitely, on Mirka's orders, herself participated in this atrocity and was in the same room, and then at school. She brought water, rolled, in turn, a barrel, changed clothes with Terentyeva and Maximova; the first one tied the boy's mouth when they carried him to school, and Yosel gave her to carry a bottle and he himself carried two; Terentyeva was the first to be forced to prick the boy in the temple, then they handed the nail to Maximova, then to her, Kozlovskaya, who pricked the child in the shoulder and handed the nail to Iosel; this one, passing the nail further, led her to the closet where the commandments are kept, forced her to swear allegiance, converted to the Jewish faith and named her in turn, a barrel, changed clothes with Terentyeva and Maximova; the first one tied the boy's mouth when they carried him to school, and Yosel gave her to carry a bottle and he himself carried two; Terentyeva was the first to be forced to prick the boy in the temple, then they handed the nail to Maximova, then to her, Kozlovskaya, who pricked the child in the shoulder and handed the nail to Iosel; this one, passing the nail further, led her to the closet where the commandments are kept, forced her to swear allegiance, converted to the Jewish faith and named her *Lyya*. When this ceremony was over and Kozlovskaya returned to the table, the boy was no longer alive. After soaking the canvas in blood, Terentyeva and Maksimova washed the corpse; dressed, Yosel brought all three Jewish women to the oath that they would keep a secret; the first two carried the corpse, and she carried the bottle of blood to Slavka, after the other Jews. When they returned, saying that they had thrown the corpse into the swamp, Slavka gave them money, and all the Jews warned them that, having quarreled drunk, they would not let it slip somehow; if this happens, then *they themselves will remain guilty and they will be flogged with a whip, and the Jews will all unlock themselves and be right*.

Finally, after a lengthy exhortation and many confrontations, according to heterogeneity, which, three years after the incident in drunken women, one cannot even be surprised, Maksimova said that she had long ago repented in spirit to the three Uniate priests she had named for complicity in this crime; and then all three - Terentyeva, Maksimova and Kozlovskaya - made *a completely unanimous testimony*, certified in all details by mutual confirmation of the co-witnesses. They told everything with complete frankness, reminding each other of various circumstances and correcting what, due to forgetfulness or for other reasons, they had first shown differently. Here is their general unanimous and detailed testimony:

"In 1823, on Lent, a week before the Jewish Passover, Hanna Tsetlin, a tavern maid, got Terentyeva drunk, gave her money and asked her to get a Christian boy. On the first day of the holiday, Terentyeva saw the boy Yemelyanov at the bridge (50) and told Hanna about it. This one, after getting her drunk, gave her money and a lump of sugar to lure the child, and Maksimova was right there at that time, saw and heard it. Terentyeva brought the boy, Hanna met them on the street in front of the house (51), led him into the yard and handed him over to Maximova, who carried him into the rooms. There were also: the husband of Hannah Eveik, the daughter of Itka and the worker of Rhys. They gave Terentyeva and Maksimova a drink, gave them money, and they fell asleep. In the evening Terentyeva was ordered to take the child to Mirka Berlin; she brought it to the room of her daughter Slavka, where there were many Jews; the boy was taken to a closet and both women were given wine to drink and money. All week Terentyeva saw the child at the Berlins, except on Wednesday, when they converted her to the Jewish faith and burned her feet. Maksimova carried it back to the Tsetlins on Monday at Svyatoy, which Kozlovskaya saw, and on Tuesday early again back. She went into the kitchen with the child to ask if the Berlins were up, and there she saw her and the child Kozlovskaya, the cook Basya and the girl Genemihl - the last two Jews. Slavka unlocked the door at Maximova's knock, she took the child and ordered to come for him in the evening, when they again carried him to the Tsetlins, where he stayed on Wednesday; Hanna ordered Maksimova to put food out of the chest in the room, they put a sleepy child there and covered it with a sheet. (52). Hanna ordered the lid to be closed loosely, and to lock it with a bast so that the boy would not suffocate, and said that at noon, her husband, the ratman, would search the Berlins' house with the police, and in the evening she said, laughing, that nothing was found there. On Thursday Maksimova took the boy back to Mirka, and Kozlovskaya saw him there and asked the cook Basya: whose is he? Maksimova did not see the boy being fed during the last days (53). On Monday at Fomina, in the evening, Hanna made both women drunk with wine, took them

to the Berlins, where Slavka had a large gathering of Jews. Mirka also gave them both a drink and asked them to go ahead and drown the corpse of the boy in the river at night. They brought the boy from the closet, undressed him according to the order of the Jews, and laid him on the table; Jew Settled circumcised (54), and Shifra Berlin cut off his nails right down to the meat. At this time Kozlovskaya returned from the drinking office; Slavka was about to go out to her in the passage, but, noticing that she had already seen something, she called her into the room, where the Jews frightened her that if she let it slip somewhere, they would do the same to her as to the boy; she swore she would remain silent. Then they continued: Terentyeva held the child over the basin, Maksimova washed him; they put it head first into a barrel, in which half of the bottom was taken out; Yosel again laid the bottom, began to roll the barrel on the floor with Terentyeva, then everyone did the same, taking turns in twos, for two hours; the child was taken out red, as if burned (55); Terentyeva wrapped it up and laid it on the table; all three women dressed in Jewish clothes, carried the child, gagging him with a handkerchief, to school, and the Jews followed them. At school they found a crowd of Jews, put the boy on the table in a trough, untied his mouth; here Orlik Devirts ordered; The Settler gave the straps, Terentyeva tied the boy's legs, under the knees, but weakly, and the Settler himself pulled them tighter. Terentyeva was ordered to hit the boy lightly on the cheeks, and after her all the others did the same; they gave a large, sharp and bright nail and ordered her to prick the child in the temple and side; then Maksimova, Kozlovskaya, Iosel, and one by one all the Jews and the Jews did the same (56). Meanwhile, Kozlovskaya was taken to the commandments in a cupboard and converted to the Jewish faith, calling her Lyya. Orlik turned the baby in the trough, who at first screamed, and then fell silent (57), looked at everyone and sighed heavily. He soon bled to death and gave up the ghost. Terentyeva took him out, untied his legs, and held him over another trough that stood on the floor; Kozlovskaya served bottles of water, Iosel poured water on the boy, and washed Maksimova. When there was no blood on the body, and only wounds were visible, the size of a pea (58), they ordered to dress and put on the corpse and put it on the table. Yosel led all three women to the closet and said: "since they all accepted the Jewish faith, they must swear by it," and read them a large Jewish book.

Then the Jews swore at the antimention stolen by Terentyeva from the Ilyinskaya church, spat on him, trampled on him, and so on (59).

Meanwhile, it was already beginning to get light; Terentyeva and Maksimova were afraid to carry the boy to the river, where sometimes there are people early, and therefore they carried him into the forest, to the swamp, near Gutorov Kryzh, where he was found. After their departure, Iosel poured blood into one bottle and ordered Kozlovskaya to take it to Slavka; the rest of the blood was left in the trough, at the school; returning from the forest, Terentyeva and Maksimova met Iosel himself in a double britzka (60); they went to watch the women, and Yosel got down from the britzka and looked where they had laid the corpse; then the Jews again galloped off to the city (61). Mirka made both women drunk with wine, Slavka gave them money and persuaded the drunks not to let it slip when they quarreled: the *Jews would all* open their mouths, she said, *and you alone would be to blame*. Both took off their Jewish clothes and went home.

In the evening, Fratkan, the wife of the barber Orlik, got Terentyeva drunk (62), dressed her in a Jewish dress and took her to school. All the same Jews and Jews were there, and, moreover, Kozlovskaya. The trough with blood was still on the table, and next to it were two empty bottles, in which the day before they brought water for washing, sending the third bottle to Slavka. There was also a roll of canvas. Hanna came with Maximova, who brought another bottle, a cup and a funnel. Terentyeva stirred the blood with a spatula, and Iosel poured it out in a glass, through a funnel into bottles and into a small keg, which was brought down by hoops, which was served by Orlik. Two canvases were soaked in the rest of the blood, Terentyeva was ordered to unscrew it, straighten it and air it, Iosel crumbled it into small shreds; Orlik dipped the nail into the remainder of the blood, dripped it on each piece of paper and made streaks over it, and each was given a piece, as well as three Russian women. All dispersed: Maksimova carried one bottle for the Tsetlins; Kozlovskaya behind the Berlins two, and Terentyev behind Orlik a barrel. Maksimova later gave her shred to Hannah; Kozlovskaya lost it, and Terentyeva said that she should have it in a Chinese pocket, which she handed over to the soldier Ivanova for safekeeping, along with other things, when she was taken into custody. The investigators immediately went there and found in the indicated place a triangular piece of canvas, reddish" and recognized by all three repentant women as the one they were talking about.

In the house of Berlin, Tsetlin and at school, all three women separately showed in full accordance with their words, where, how and what was done; these details and the area where the terrible crime was committed, embarrassed them greatly, and they could hardly speak.

Fratka told Terentyeva that they rub the eyes of newborns with a bloody rag, and put the blood in matzo (in unleavened bread). This is in full agreement with many of the information above and with the testimony on the occasion of similar incidents. The next year after that, Terentyeva herself baked matzah with this blood with Fratka and other Jewish women. Maksimova describes in detail how she did the same at Hanna's, soaking the blood dried in a bottle and mixing it with saffron infusion. Hanna also put some of this blood in the honey they drank. Kozlovskaya says that they did the same at the Berlins: they shook out dry blood from the bottle, ground it and poured it into a saffron infusion, which they poured into the dough.

Major General Shkurin took Terentyeva and Maksimova with him and went to Vitebsk and Lezna, where they carried blood. Maksimova pointed out in Vitebsk the house where she brought the blood, with Movsha Belenitsky, and recognized the owner; Terentyeva could not identify her on the first day, she asked to give her time, and the next day she announced that there was nothing to look for far away. The commission stayed in the same house and even in the same room where it brought blood in 1823. She proved this by pointing out a fireplace hidden in the wall, where at that time the hoops and staves of the barrel were burned; told all the location of the house, although she spent the night under guard and did not go anywhere, she said that there should be another door leading directly to the kitchen, and this turned out to be fair. She recognized all the hosts, whom she described in advance during interrogation back in Velizh: Movsha, his wife, Zelika, his mother Rivka, Aron, his wife Risa; Rivka at that time herself accepted the keg of blood from her. She could not remember other houses where they treated her. Mogilev province in the town of Lezne, Terentyeva could not give positive instructions, since five years had already passed and she had not been to Lezna again.

Melanya Zhelnova, Maksimova's daughter, testified that, having come to her mother on Svyatoy, she was sent by the Jewess Risa, who served in the house with Maksimova, to a special room or closet, where there was a chest with food; glancing at him briefly, she saw in him a sleeping boy in a white shirt, or covered with something white. She testified that she had seen the boy in Tsetlina's bedroom.

The petty bourgeois Daria Kosachevskaya testified that, going on the first day of the Saint for beer, she saw how Hanna Tsetlin was leading a three-year-old boy by the hand to her house in exactly the same clothes as Yemelyanov's missing son was wearing. At a confrontation with Tsetlina, Daria raised both hands, turning to the image, and said: "Hannah, have mercy, you never did harm to me, I have nothing to be angry with you; God kill me if I said even one word of untruth!"

The worker Marya Kovaleva, whom Terentyeva and Maksimova referred to in another case involving the same Jews, locked herself up for a long time, finally confessed to everything, telling all the details, in accordance with the first; but then, frightened by this, having wept and wept for some time, and saying that she had ruined herself, that she would not live anywhere, she strangled herself.

Then it was discovered that at the time of the incident, the Berlins had a fire burning at night, that they and their neighbor Nakhimovsky had Zhids on guard in the yard that night, while neither before nor after the incident happened. Berlin could not give any account of why he had night watchmen, saying only, finally, that this was done out of a precaution so that his gate would not be smeared with blood, or other dirty tricks would be done. The watchmen, being found and convicted, after denial, assured that they had been appointed so, for nothing, agreeing that at that time there was neither theft nor fires in Velizh.

Ratmans Tsetlin and Oleinik, as mentioned above, forcibly burst into a strange yard with a crowd of Jews and measured the progress of the priest's britzka, spreading the rumor that he ran over the dear child. Removed from the case on this occasion, Tsetlin tried with all his might to get back as a deputy to the commission and even demanded this in writing. Berlin assured that the boy was given for treatment to the doctor Levin, who testified to the corpse, and that the doctor, having killed him, took him out into the swamp and abandoned him. The barber Orlik spread a rumor that the child was accidentally killed with shot from a gun, which is why there were wounds all over the body, and then thrown. Orlik only forgot to explain (63) how and why the child was first undressed for this, then washed and dressed again; because the dress was intact and there was not even a drop of blood on the linen. Regarding circumcision, the Jews said that it was done with the intent to cast suspicion on the Jews.

During the general search of twelve people, the Christians did not show anything bad about the Berlins, but declared under oath their confidence that the boy had been killed by the Jews and that, according to general rumors, the Berlins and Tsetlins, who are now extremely concerned and fussing over this matter, took part in this.



All three women, having slandered up to fifty Jews in total as participants in this villainy, recognized them at face-to-face confrontations; they also slandered some Abram, and Abram Vazmensky was taken on this suspicion: but all three women, each separately, announced that this was not the one and that they did not know this.

The Uniate priest Martusevich was the admonitioner of three witnesses, and the Jews tried to bribe him by sending a tailor to him so that Martusevich would persuade the women to recant their testimony; this is positively proved by the testimony of the priest himself, his wife, and another third witness. Terentyeva and Maksimova, callous and depraved women, being brought to school and to the Tsetlins' house, to the scene of the crime, and obliged to tell in full detail where, what and how happened, looked around with fear, trembled and cried. They were at enmity with each other, quarreled in the presence of the commission, reproached each other, recalled the old, and therefore in no case could they invent everything that they showed by mutual agreement.

It was mentioned above that this whole affair began as a result of Terentyeva's divination, at the request of the baby's mother, and as a result of the prediction of the girl Eremeeva. The first is not surprising, because Terentyeva knew well where the child was, but the second requires an explanation.

Anna Eremeeva walked the world, was an orphan, subject to some kind of painful seizures, died, was almost buried, came to her senses again and, having told some wonderful dream or vision, became famous for this and predicted to the gullible for their daily bread. During interrogation, she explained the riddle and appeared, instead of a forerunner, as *a witness*. Entering Great Lent in the canopy of Berlin to beg for alms, she heard that Terentyeva, laughing, said loudly: "As I swore an oath to you to serve faithfully, I assure you that I will get it on the first day of the holiday." Knowing from an early age that the Jews were torturing and killing children around Easter, Eremeeva immediately understood this conversation, she was frightened, especially since at the same time three Jews came out into the hallway, looked at her and at each other and began to interrogate her who she was. All day long she kept thinking about what she had heard, and in the evening she again crept up to the Berlins' house and hid in the passage at the door; Evidently, there were no Jews in this half, and Terentyeva was talking to Maksimova; the latter said: "Our Jews wanted to lure the girl who came in the morning, but I advised them against it, it's dangerous." The first answered: "I myself saw that they sharpened their teeth on her, but it was definitely dangerous. I promised to get it, so I'll get it from the soldier's settlement; let them wait; you have to do it properly so that you can bury the ends, as you and I, Avdotyushka, did before." (64). Eremeeva was frightened, left quietly, wanted to wander around the next day near the house to peep, but fell ill, barely dragged herself to the village of Sentyura, where the tradesman Pestun, a very pious man, looked after her and took her into the house. She was still afraid of the Jews and was afraid to say what she saw and heard, and therefore when later the child really disappeared in Velizh and his mother came to her for predictions, she, Eremeeva, told her that she had seen a dream in which the archangel appeared to her Michael; the boy was sitting in the flowers, a snake hissed at him - that is, Terentyeva, Eremeeva explains, - the archangel told her that the baby was destined to be a sufferer from the Jews for Christianity; then she described, according to the signs, the house of the Berlins and added that if they did not have time to save the boy, then he would die. Eremeeva does not explain why she told her mother that she went into that house, where her son is kept; but it can be assumed that the upset mother herself let it slip and forgot about it, and Eremeeva took advantage of this.

This is what the accusations of the Jews consisted of; it remains to be seen what their justifications were.

The common thing in all the answers of the Jews was an impudent and unfounded denial of almost everything they were asked about, why most of them were convicted of false reviews and testimonies. Many of them assured that they did not know Terentyev at all and were positively convicted of lying; Hanna Tsetlin stubbornly maintained that she was ill at that time and did not go out, but she was found otherwise. The general and obviously conditional excuse of the Jews was: "If the witnesses take it all upon themselves, then there is nothing to look for, and, therefore, they did it and are to blame." The incident itself was known throughout the province, occupied everyone, and some Jews assured that they had not even heard of it at all. The whole city went to look at the body of the martyr out of compassion, but not a single Jew came for it, while this people, out of their extreme curiosity, converge in a crowd to stare at everyone,

The defendants testified that they did not belong to any sect, while all Velizh Jews were divided into *Misnagids* and *Hasidim*, and the defendants all belonged to the latter. This is all the more remarkable because the converted Jew Neophyte, of whom it is mentioned at the beginning of this note, explains in his book precisely that the brutal (65) custom, which is being discussed here, belongs to the *Hasidim alone*.

In general, the Jews could not refute the accusations in any way, except by unfounded denial, stubborn, malicious silence, shouting, frantic abuse, or, recovering themselves, reasoning that this could not be; what do the Jews need blood for? They don't need blood; it is not necessary to torment the boy; it is even forbidden to believe this by the orders of various kings, as well as the sovereign emperor Alexander I, and precisely from March 6, 1817. The commission constantly recorded in the journals during each interrogation that the interrogated person showed extreme embarrassment, fear, trembled, sighed, got confused and started talking, canceled the testimony, did not want to sign them, assured that he was ill and did not remember what he was saying; many lost their temper, and not only, after the lowest scolding, they threw themselves in a rage at the witnesses, then they shouted at the members, scolded them with bad words, threw themselves on the floor, shouted guard, while no one touched them with a finger, and so on. Is this the behavior of the innocents who are blamed for such a terrible atrocity? Some pretended to be crazy, others tried several times to escape from the guard, and some fled and were not found.

Correspondence was intercepted between the kept and free Jews on shreds, torches, on dishes in which they carried food, and so on. Despite the darkness of the meaning of these notes and the incessantly occurring word *knew*, that is, be smart, guess - it is clear and indisputable that there was a skirmish between the Jews, that they agreed on how and what to answer and notified each other about this. So, Itka Tsetlin wrote in several notes: "Who else have they taken?.. Many more will be detained. It will be bad, but you can sacrifice yourself to glorify God's name. Do what you know, for there is nothing to lose. Very bad; three women talked until my eyes went dark; at first I held firm until I fell off my feet. In short, very bad, try to do it to glorify God's name and sacrifice yourself; there is nothing to lose. There is little hope for all of us, it will be very bad for everyone." Khaim Khripun wrote: "If you decide that my wife does not run away, then, for God's sake, exhort her so that she knows how to tell her if she is taken. Notify me did I speak well during the interrogation. Let your fingers know how many people are still taken. Try all for us, all Israel; no one thinks: if they don't touch me, then I don't need it! - We are contained, God save, for the sake of a death sentence! During the interrogation, I said that I did not know and had not heard whether the boy was found alive or dead. Run wherever Israel is scattered, cry out loud: Woe, woe! to try to testify for us; we lack more strength; frighten the witnesses through the watchmen, tell them that there is a command of the sovereign such: if they are the first to depart from their words, they will be forgiven; and if not, they will be punished," and so on. Is it possible that such correspondence can somehow win over the defendants, but on the contrary, does not expose them to a crime? Finally, some of the defendants, having lost heart and not seeing the possibility of locking themselves up any longer, with so many clear evidence, they confessed, but again denied, such are Feiga Vulfson, Nota Prudkov, Zelik Brusovansky, Fratka Devirts, Itska Nakhimovsky; meanwhile, the entire community of Jews who remained at large tried to slow down and confuse matters with all possible intrigues; they filed petitions for the defendants, insistently demanded admission to them, complained about their predilection for them, declared them now sick, now insane, demanded the removal of investigators and the appointment of new ones, and so on. The whole hope of the Jews, who even talked about this several times in the commission, was that the matter could not be finally decided here and that wherever it went, they would give an answer and justify themselves, and the witnesses would be the only ones to blame. meanwhile, the entire community of Jews who remained at large tried to slow down and confuse matters with all possible intrigues; they filed petitions for the defendants, insistently demanded admission to them, complained about their predilection for them, declared them now sick, now insane, demanded the removal of investigators and the appointment of new ones, and so on. The whole hope of the Jews, who even talked about this several times in the commission, was that the matter could not be finally decided here and that wherever it went, they would give an answer and justify themselves, and the witnesses would be the only ones to blame. demanded the elimination of investigators and the appointment of new ones, and so on. The whole hope of the Jews, who even talked about this several times in the commission, was that the matter could not be finally decided here and that wherever it went, they would give an answer and justify themselves, and the witnesses would be the only ones to blame. demanded the elimination of investigators and the appointment of new ones, and so on. The whole hope of the Jews, who even talked about this several times in the commission, was that the matter could not be finally decided here and that wherever it went, they would give an answer and justify themselves, and the witnesses would be the only ones to blame. ( 66 ) . Consider, for example, some answers of the Jews ( 67 )

*Shmerka Berlin* gave a cunning, deliberate answer, proving that all this is unrealizable, impossible, that it has long been forbidden to believe in such fairy tales and nonsense. He had a full supply of papers relating to such cases, copies of decrees, correspondence where he demands information about how a similar case ended in Mogilev, and so on. All this proves that he, having been arrested suddenly, prepared himself, however, for this, and pondered his defense. He believed that the boy was moved and stabbed out of anger at the Jews (68). But why are the underwear and dress not punctured, and if all this is a lie, then why will the punctured corpse point specifically to the Jews as to the culprits? Assuring that Terentyev did not know, he shouted towards her, as soon as she entered: "this is the first infection: she will surely begin to say the same thing!"

His brother *Noson Berlin* hesitated, got confused, out of stubbornness did not answer questions for an hour or more, did not want to sign his testimony without any reason; at face-to-face confrontations, he trembled with anger and reviled the witnesses in every possible way. He was so rude and impudent that the commission could not cope with him. Repeatedly convicted of blatant lies. After long convictions that he was obliged to sign his testimony, he finally signed *that he did not confirm them* - although nothing was contained in the testimony, as his answer, that he *did not know and was not aware of anything*.

*Hirsch Berlin* wrung his hands desperately, did not know what to answer to the evidence, shouted at Terentyev: "You're lying, I never knew you," and, forgetting, he immediately added: "you were a beggar, walked around the world."

*Meyer Berlin* furiously rushed at Terentyev in the presence of the commission; when they stopped him, and Terentyeva began to accuse him of all the details of the incident, he desperately wrung his hands, was silent, looked around wildly, sighed heavily and claimed that he did not know this woman.

*Rivka Berlin* (Sundulikha) denied it so impudently and unfoundedly that she constantly contradicted herself and had to admit to lying. She claimed that the Jewess Lyva had never served with her, that she did not know Terentyeva; Lyva herself accused her of serving with her for several years; and after forgetting Terentyev, Rivka said that she had known her as a worthless drunkard for a long time, even when she lived with Captain Polsky.

*Slavka Berlin*, entering the presence, she herself began to tell with surprise that she had now met some kind of woman (Terentyev) in the hall, who bowed to her and called her by name, while she, Slavka, did not know her at all. Confused, spoke, again unlocked; she was so embarrassed that, having said a word, she then assured the whole presence to her face as if she had never said it, thus constantly denying her own words, without any need or purpose, renouncing everything and showing only that nothing about what she doesn't know and doesn't know, the next day she demanded the annihilation of the interrogation, assuring her that yesterday she had spoken against herself out of fright. With difficulty it was possible to finish the interrogation in the course of several hours, because Slavka each time assured her that she was being deceived and that they were writing the wrong thing. Terentyeva said to her, sobbing: "as she said then that you would deny everything, that's what you're doing now!" When the child disappeared and no one knew where he had gone, Terentyeva and Eremeeva already said that he was being kept by Slavka or by her mother, Mirka. A night watchman was posted in her yard for several nights, while neither before nor after the incident did she have a night watch. She asserted that the witnesses were in any case alone to blame for not announcing this incident, if it happened, at the same time that it happened.

*Basya Aronson* said among other things, confused in her testimony: "I am not so pious that I should be in such a case." Consequently, she looked at the torture of a Christian boy as a charitable deed.

*Ezvik Zetlin*, ratman, notifying his people about when there will be a search in the house, and after that about the progress of the case; being removed, he tried to be admitted again as a deputy; tried to avert suspicion on the priest. At face-to-face confrontations, he lost his temper: now he threw himself with malice and with threats, then again he begged the witnesses and flattered them. He lost himself, forgot himself, shouted and constantly contradicted himself. He did not sign his testimony, without declaring the reasons for it; pretended to be crazy, raged, and then asked for forgiveness. He said among other things: "What are you asking me? in Russia every faith is tolerable." - When he renounced everything, and Terentyeva, incriminating him, put her hand on her heart and said, looking into his eyes: "Are you telling the truth?" - then Tsetlin answered timidly: "I do not say that I am telling the truth, but I only say that I know nothing and have not seen anything." This answer is quite worthy of a follower of Talmudic tricks. Instead of making excuses for the murder, he only tried to convince that the Jews did not need blood and that it was forbidden to believe it.

*Hanna Zetlin*, Evzika's wife, claimed that she had not left the yard all week, due to illness of her and her son, and witnesses testified under oath that they had seen her on the street; an outside woman even saw how she was leading the dead child by the hand, near her house, and Terentyeva testified that she had then handed the boy to her. The county doctor, whom she referred to regarding her son's serious illness, testified that he knew nothing about it. She assured that she had not heard about the disappearance of the boy at all; that even Terentyeva does not know at all, whereas already at the first investigation she said that she had repeatedly driven this beggar out of her house. At confrontations, she turned pale, trembled, then almost fainted and fell, then she suddenly lost her temper and screamed furiously, scolded, did not give answers, shouted only: all this is a lie, the women were taught, they lie, let them answer themselves. In the presence of the commission, she frightened the witnesses with a whip and persuaded them to recant their words; at last she began to scream and thrash about beside herself, incoherently, so that nothing could be written down. Maksimova told her to her face that after this incident she had full will in the house and that Tsetlina was afraid of her. The same was confirmed by Maksimova's daughter, Zhelnova, a Jewess Rivka, and Hanna herself, calling Maksimova drunk and violent, admitted that this worker often frightened her, although she did not understand why.

*Risa Yankeleva*, the Tsetlins' worker, said otherwise at every interrogation, got confused, excused by her weak memory; herself, after interrogation, again asked to be present and, without showing anything new, denied in the former, meanwhile repeating the same thing again.

*Ruman Nakhimovsky*, during the interrogation, stood in a corner, clutched his stomach with his hands and shook as if in a fever, sighed heavily, barely answered; but when Terentyev came in, he began to shout at her and scold her; Kozlovskaya said that "she was still young then and would not have been allowed into such a thing"; in the presence of strong and detailed evidence, the witness grabbed his head with both hands, turned away from the presence, leaned his head against the stove, and was stubbornly silent, saying only that he was unwell and could not speak.

*Itska Nakhimovsky*, his brother, told General Shkurin that he wanted to declare the whole truth; being called to the commission, he began: "God has been tormenting me for another year in captivity, and God knows the truth: apparently, he is tormenting me so that the Sovereign finds out the truth," but then he changed his mind and assured that, out of stupidity, he himself did not know that spoke, and urged that the first testimony be destroyed. Then he fled, but, being caught, knelt before the mirror and said: "I will reveal to the sovereign himself the whole truth about the murder of the boy," and gave a signature in that; but afterwards he again denied and pretended to be mad.

*Yosel Mirlas*, the clerk of Berlin, referred to the command of the Polish king Sigismund and the highest command of 1817, which was not ordered to believe such stories, was beside himself, trembled, shouted: "Oh my God, what will it be!" - leaned against the wall, supporting his stomach with his hands, and said: "I myself don't know what is happening to me; I'm getting quite sick here; when she (Terentyeva) says this, so, therefore, she did it!" Then he was stubbornly silent and did not answer.

*Yosel Glikman* believed that the boy was stabbed to the Jews as a joke. At face-to-face confrontations, he threw himself on his knees in despair, shouting: "Have mercy, have mercy!" - He covered his face with his hands, trembled, turned away and announced that he did not want to look at accusers.

*Orlik Devirts*, a Jewish barber, assured that the boy had been killed by shot, but denied even this, against five witnesses. He answered timidly, slowly; He was confused, assured that his mouth was dry and he could not speak; having shown that he knew Terentyev when she lived with the merchant Babka, and that she was dragging from house to house, he again denied his words and assured that he did not know her at all. He shouted that he did not want to talk to the women at all, and did not sign his testimony, because he did not remember what he had said. They found evidence prepared by him that he was a skilled paramedic; when asked why he prepared them, Orlik answered: "when they send me to Siberia, I will show them there, maybe at least they won't force them to dig the earth."

His wife, *Fratka*, announced, having entered the commission, that she would not answer at all, and was silent for a long time; then she began to shout, scold, walk up and down, stomp, shouting in a frenzy: "What do you want from me? Why don't you invite others? My husband was not alone when they injected the boy. Everyone says that Hannah Tsetlin is to blame - ask her, not me. Later she said that she herself was not at the murder, but that Ruman Nakhimovsky confessed to her that the boy was killed in his presence at the school by Berlin; that at the same time there were also: Mirka, Slavka, Shmerka, Hirsh, Shifra, Yankel, Basya, Evzik, Hannah and so on. That after this incident, these Jews started their own special school, because others were afraid of getting caught - and the investigation revealed that indeed at that time a separate, small school was opened. She repeated the same to the watchmen and guards, beat herself

with a log, saying: "it would be so if everyone, who pricked the boy." Then she added: "I would tell everyone who and how they stabbed, but I'm afraid they will drag me out, and I'm afraid of my Jews." She confirmed the same in the commission, but did not want to say more and added: "If the Jews find out about this, then I am lost." At her direction, a special knife was found, in a silver frame and a morocco scabbard, with which, according to her, the circumcision was performed on the boy; the witnesses also believed that it must be the same knife. Twice that it must be the same knife. Twice (69) tried to escape but was caught; knocked out the glass, and wanted to kill herself with a fragment of it. Then again she renounced everything; and when the commission discussed the knife with which the murder was committed, *Fratka* said: "here we need not knives, but nails." She screamed that she would tell the whole truth to one sovereign; told the guard non-commissioned officer, in a conversation, that Berlin needed blood, because her *children were not standing*. Finally she said, losing her temper, in the commission: "Perhaps our people did this before, but not now; and that Terentyeva stabbed the boy, so it's true. Take me, flog me with a whip, I want it, I take everything upon myself, and I won't tell you the truth."

*Zelik Brusovansky*, with strong evidence, said: "If someone from my family, or at least another Jew, confesses, then I will say that it is true."

*Itska Belyaev* trembled, now from fear, now from anger, cursed and shouted, so that the commission could not cope with him. When Terentyeva, during the evidence (70), said that even now her legs burned in a frying pan still hurt, *Itska* asked, smiling: "how, at the age of three, your burnt legs could not heal you"?

*Yankel Chernomordin* (Cockerel), not listening to anything, shouted: this is trouble, this is an attack; then, falling on his face and covering his face with his hands: "Have mercy! I don't know what she (*Maksimova*) is saying," and didn't want to look at her.

His wife, *Esther*, testified that she did not know Terentyeva at all, and then she got confused herself and confessed otherwise. In a frenzy, she rushed at the accusers and abused them.

*Khaina Chernomordin* assured that she had not seen any of these three women and had not heard at all about the murder of the boy. She turned pale and trembled, could not stand still, hesitated, turned away; she was stubbornly silent, or screamed angrily, and did not at all want to look at the bloody piece of canvas shown to her, which was mentioned above.

*Chaim Black*(Hoarse) shouted, scolded, trembled, did not answer questions and got confused. "Let the women say what they want," he said, "not a single Jew will tell you that, no matter how much you ask." - Angrily denied that, when Terentyeva was converted, he was lying on the same bed with her, - and in the intercepted correspondence he begs the Jews not to swear at him for this, otherwise he will go crazy with shame and disgrace, while he is ready to sacrifice his life for them. He brazenly shouted at the commission, each time again demanding that his previous testimony be read to him in advance; saying flatly that he had not even heard of this incident, he let it slip later that he knew about it at the same time when it happened. He forgot himself and lost his temper so much that he scolded all the members in the face, in full presence, and shouted to the chairman, General Shkurin, pointing his finger at him: "I will gouge out your eyes, a robber, you are a villain" - and so on. Chaim was already on trial in 1806, along with other Jews, on suspicion of torturing and murdering a boy, the landowner Mordvinov; due to lack of evidence, the case was committed to the will of God.

*Abram Kissin* was confused and contradicted himself; once he showed that he was illiterate, and on the other, that he knew how to read and write in Jewish and Russian; said that he was not at all related to the Berlins, while he was closely related to them; said that Terentyeva did not know at all, that if she confessed, then she must be the murderer, and he was convicted that he had known her for a long time. Finally, he sobbed, looked wildly, like a madman, fell prostrate on the floor and shouted: "Have mercy, fight!" He shouted that he was ill, that he could not speak; he was thrown and broken, and he pretended to be crazy, shouted and raged.

*Nota Prudkov* - wanted to prove that he was at the time of the incident on Serteyskaya (71) pier, - but it was proved that he was then in Velizh and, moreover, his correspondence was intercepted, where he asked to get a certificate for money that he was on Serteyskaya, and to draw up a false contract with the peasants, - he assured that not a single accuser was knows, but in letters to his wife he calls all three by name and in the commission he called Terentyev a dissolute one. He said he was sick and, tying up his beard, demanded at a confrontation that the accusers tell what color his beard was; said to General Shkurin: "If the sovereign himself had promised pardon to the Jews, they would, of



course, have confessed”; that it is as if the Jews had killed the boy and others are now grumbling at the Berlins and Tsetlins for this dangerous deed, that they are now collecting money everywhere for this deed, hoping that it will not end here (72); but that he, Prudkov, confesses nothing to the commission. Meanwhile, three officials were hidden at General Shkurin's, who heard all this and confirmed it under oath. Three times (73) tried to leave custody; wanted to be baptized, then changed his mind; volunteered to confess everything personally to the Governor-General, was sent to Vitebsk, but deceived. He made a noise, shouted, hit the guard non-commissioned officer on the cheek, and was punished for this, but did not calm down; when the intercepted notes of his were shown to him in the commission, he became embittered to the point of fury, shouted and scolded, without giving an answer. “The law does not say anything about what will happen if someone slaughters a boy; we are not afraid of anything, as long as the case gets out of the commission. You are all robbers; nothing will happen to us, but you will be judged, you will see!”

*Itska Vulfson*, who went with Yosel Mirlas to inspect the corpse of a baby thrown into the forest, was so lost that, showing that he did not know how to read and write, he himself signed his interrogation in Russian. Assuring that Terentyev did not know at all, he added: “and no one converted her to the Jewish faith - at least when I left for Dinaburg she was not Jewish.” So he knew her even then?

His wife, *Feiga*, testified that she was not at all in Velizh at that time, while her husband testified that she was there. At face-to-face confrontations, she almost fainted, could not stand, lay down on a chair, complained of nausea, stubbornly kept silent and did not sign her testimony, for no reason. Further, she was ready to confess to everything, but she asked: “Is there such a law that when someone confesses to everything, he will be forgiven?” She was told that the law in such a case lightens the punishment; then she said in despair: “I got caught with the others through my stupidity” - and then stubbornly remained silent. I wanted to be baptized, and then changed my mind again. “I must not convict my mother,” she also said, “and even then all Jews must perish.”

*Lylya Rudnyakova*, a former worker of Rivka Berlin, at first denied that she had never served with Rivka, then she was convicted, confessed, and involuntarily convicted Rivka of the same. She assured me that she did not know Terentyev at all, but meanwhile she said that she was a beggar and walked around the world. During interrogations, she drew some signs on the back of the child in her arms with her finger, and when asked what she was doing, she answered: “This is Rivka, in Hebrew.” When they showed her a bloody piece of canvas, she was very frightened, sobbed and abused Terentyev with the most obscene abuse.

*Zusya Rudnikov*, Lylya's husband, also assured that he had not even heard of the incident, which was discussed in Velizh for three years at all intersections. He looked at the ground, spoke abruptly (74), denying everything. He trembled when he saw the bloody rag, turned away, did not want to look at it, and did not want to go up to the table for anything. He did not sign the confrontation, the flow that made him dizzy, he himself does not understand what is being read to him, and does not know whether this is what he said.

*Blula Nafanova*. When Terentyeva told her: “You shouldn’t deny me, you knew me for a long time, even when Khorka was killed,” Bluma shouted: “What do you care about Khorka now? Then there was judgment. - It turned out that Bluma, among others, was suspected in 1821 of the murder of Khristina Slepovronskaya, who was also tortured to death in a Jewish school.

*Rokhlya Feitelson*, having entered the presence, did not yet allow herself to be asked anything and began to shout: “I don’t know why they took me; don’t ask me about anything, I don’t know anything, I haven’t been anywhere, I haven’t seen anything.” She was also confused, lost and trembling.

Here are the main answers and justifications of the Jews - if only it can be called answers and justifications - written out briefly, but with accuracy and without omitting even a single word that could serve to justify the defendants. No such word was uttered. Only denial, often outright lies, fear and anger, that's what was revealed during interrogations. Meanwhile, the matter dragged on, and the commission, in spite of all its efforts, could not move forward; the Jews, obviously and undoubtedly convicted, were silent, stubborn, rude; Governor-General Prince Khovansky informed the sovereign about this and it was ordered to exhort the Jews, and to punish the violent ones. With regard to several similar cases opened in 1827, through the same witnesses, it was ordered that the same commission investigate everything; in 1828 an official from the Governing Senate was sent to the commission; and then it was also ordered to interrogate the defendants whether they had any prejudice. Some have shown that there was not, but others have complained of addiction, without, however, being able to explain what exactly it consisted of; they spoke only in general terms, that they were interrogated in the wrong way, they wrote answers in the wrong words, they

asked as criminals, while three women confessed and, therefore, were real criminals; that investigators and members of the commission were not removed at their request, and the like. were real criminals; that investigators and members of the commission were not removed at their request, and the like. were real criminals; that investigators and members of the commission were not removed at their request, and the like.

In 1829, the commission presented at last a complete review of these terrible incidents, blaming the Jews for everything and considering them convicted; in addition to those who died and fled, there were still forty-two people of both sexes left in custody. The governor-general was of the same opinion as his predecessor, - he presented a detailed, most humble report, in which he also positively accused the Jews and considered them exposed.

In the matter itself, considering all the circumstances, it is impossible not to agree with the conclusion of the commission and the governor-general. The predictions of Terentyeva and Yeremeyeva, according to which the incident came true, are completely wrong (75) understandable, if you do not believe them, that one sold the boy herself, and the other overheard the conversation; the concordant testimony of Terentyeva, Maksimova and Kozlovskaya about all the details of the murder and similar circumstances that agree with it, confirmed by outside witnesses under oath, the complete impossibility of making such a consensual testimony in everything and not changing it for several years, if it were not one truth - especially if we consider that two of these women lived in constant enmity, could not speak to each other indifferently, even in the presence of a commission, and the third was already married to a gentry and could not have any reason for such a terrible slander against herself and others; further, the testimony of extraneous witnesses, some of whom saw how the Jews galloped at dawn in a cart in the direction where the corpse was found, (76); the condition in which the corpse was found - skin abrasions, wounds, swollen, crimson legs, a flattened mouth and nose, a bruise from a knot on the back of the head, cut nails, Jewish circumcision, and so on. - quite consistent with the testimony of three women about how the child was tortured; the behavior of the defendants during interrogations, their apparent skirmish, their impudent and senseless denial in everything related to this case; exposure of each of them in many false testimonies; pretending some are sick and crazy; the flight of others and the attempts of others to do so; trying to bribe the priest, the admonisher of the witnesses; night guards and gatherings at the Berlin, Nakhimov, Tsetlins - in which they also locked themselves at first; and finally the own consciousness of Nota Prudkov, Zelik Brusovanskago, Fratka Dewirtz, Feiga Wulfson and Itski Nakhimovsky in a crime (77) and the obvious hesitation of others, as well as the correspondence intercepted from them, exposing the guilty - these are the evidence and evidence on which the commission and the governor-general were based, they considered the Jews so convicted that they already found their own consciousness unnecessary, all the more that not a single circumstance spoke in favor of the Jews, and not one of them could present any justifications or proofs of his innocence - except for obvious lies and brazen denials. They presented (78) , with a general and detailed report (79) , a nominal list of Jews, where the degree of guilt of each was indicated in detail.

There was a disagreement in the Governing Senate; some y.y. the senators agreed with the conclusion of the commission and sentenced the Jews to punishment; others hesitated; still others justified them; again, others only wished to take precautionary measures for the future and made various assumptions about this. Therefore, the matter was submitted to the State Council, where on January 18, 1835, the Supremely approved opinion was held:

That the testimonies of the scammers, containing many contradictions and inconsistencies, without any positive evidence or undoubted arguments, cannot be accepted as judicial evidence to accuse the Jews; and therefore:

1. Jews defendants in the case of the murder of a soldier's son Yemelyanov and in other similar cases, which are in the Velizh proceedings, as well as in cases of desecration of a Christian shrine, as they were not positively convicted, to be released from trial and investigation.

2. Evangelists, Christians: the peasant woman Terentyeva, the soldier Maximova and the gentry Kozlovskaya, who did not prove those terrible crimes and apostasy from the faith that they erected on themselves, but were guilty of slander, which they later could not confirm in any way, exiled to Siberia for a settlement, depriving Kozlovskaya of the nobility.

Then (80) , Eremeev, Zhelnov and so on. release, betraying the first church repentance.

## CONCLUSION

Having considered this whole series of terrible cases and incidents that shock the soul, partly proven historically and legally, the accusation of the Jews of the martyrdom of Christian babies by Easter cannot be considered a ghost and superstition, but one must make sure that the accusation is well-founded [\(81\)](#) , as well as the general opinion about the use of the blood of these martyrs for some mysterious charms. There is a circumstance, which was already mentioned at the beginning of this note, indisputable and obvious, to which no one has paid attention until now in research on this subject, while it should serve as a striking conviction for all doubters. No one, of course, will dispute that in countries where the Jews are tolerated, the corpses of babies have been found from time to time, always in the same distorted form, or at least with similar signs of violence and death. It is no less true that these signs proved deliberate, deliberate villainy, the martyrdom of a child, and, moreover, a Christian child: both have been proved by a multitude of investigative, judicial and medical evidence. But how to explain such an incomprehensible riddle, although by any assumption, not only proof, how can one explain what could induce anyone to such a senseless brutal act, if this is not some mysterious, Kabbalistic or religiously fanatical goal? Neither greed, nor malice, nor other passions and motives can explain this in any way. There is not one murder here, but a deliberate martyrdom of an innocent baby and, consequently, either the enjoyment of these torments, or a special goal connected with them. Catholic Christians celebrated the remembrance of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ in their faces, betraying the reproach of Judas; in Russia there was a sense of schismatics, called detogbitsy - they killed illegitimate children, dried and powdered the heart taken out of them and used it for spells to attract followers; Muslims of the Caucasus [\(82\)](#) , celebrate in a similar way the memory of their prophet [\(83\)](#) , cursing solemnly over his adversary Aliy [\(84\)](#) why a person is hired for money; the Jews do the same, if they can, on the feast of Haman and Passover; this is known not only historically, from the time of Emperor Theodosius, but is known to everyone who lived among the Jews. So, for example, the inhabitants of Kharkov still remember the water carrier, who disappeared annually for three days during Holy Week and suddenly left those he served without water. At that time, he was constantly hired by the Jews to represent the Savior and allowed, for a good pay, to tie his hands, beat him on the cheeks, but it didn't hurt, as he assured, to spit, shout, scold and swear at himself as much as he liked. He was kept at this time at school and fed well. Is it then possible to doubt that the frantic, fanatical Jews would be ready to go one step further and play this comedy to the end, if it wasn't dangerous? And if some kind of cabalistic, magical use of Christian blood is added to this, then can the combination of one and the other goal and the fanaticism based on this seem so unbelievable as to accuse and punish Christian accusers rather than the Jews convicted by them? Where did these identically and deliberately distorted corpses of innocent children come from? Why are they found only where there are Jews? Why is it always the children of Christians? And finally, why did these cases always occur only during or just before Easter itself? From this tangle of undeniable events, from this labyrinth, there is no way out, unless we follow the only path that the uninterrupted thread of facts that accompanies each such case shows us. The compiler of this note personally knew in the western provinces of our learned and educated doctor, a Jew, who, in a frank conversation, eye to eye, on this subject, himself admitted that the accusation was, without a doubt, thorough, that there are Jews who, in their fanaticism, encroach on such outrageous villainy, but argued only that this is not a proper Jewish rite, but the invention of the degenerates of mankind. A baptized, learned Jew is also serving in St. Petersburg, who with complete conviction confirms the existence of this rite - not in a general form, as it is expressed, but as an exception - but at the same time he refuses to testify to this anywhere. publicly, because, of course, they are not able to prove the truth of their words and even fear the revenge of rich Jews, whose intrigues reach far and who would consider such an accusation a general insult to the Israeli people and a personal insult to themselves. eye to eye, on this subject, he himself admitted that the accusation was, no doubt, thorough, that there are Jews who, in their fanaticism, encroach on such outrageous villainy, but he only asserted that this was not a proper Jewish rite, but an invention of the degenerates of mankind. A baptized, learned Jew is also serving in St. Petersburg, who with complete conviction confirms the existence of this rite - not in a general form, as it is expressed, but as an exception - but at the same time he refuses to testify to this anywhere. publicly, because, of course, they are not able to prove the truth of their words and even fear the revenge of rich Jews, whose intrigues reach far and who would consider such an accusation a general insult to the Israeli people and a personal insult to themselves. eye to eye, on this subject, he himself admitted that the accusation was, no doubt, thorough, that there are Jews who, in their fanaticism, encroach on such outrageous villainy, but he only asserted that this was not a proper Jewish rite, but an invention of the degenerates of mankind. A baptized, learned Jew is also serving in St. Petersburg, who with complete conviction confirms the existence of this rite - not in a general form, as it is expressed, but as an exception - but at the same time he refuses to testify to this anywhere. publicly, because, of course, they are not able to prove the truth of their words and even fear the revenge of rich Jews, whose intrigues reach far and who would consider such an accusation a general insult to the Israeli people and a personal insult to themselves. that this accusation is, no doubt, thorough, that there are Jews who, in their fanaticism,

encroach on such outrageous villainy, but only asserted that this is not a proper Jewish rite, but an invention of the degenerates of mankind. A baptized, learned Jew is also serving in St. Petersburg, who with complete conviction confirms the existence of this rite - not in a general form, as it is expressed, but as an exception - but at the same time he refuses to testify to this anywhere. publicly, because, of course, they are not able to prove the truth of their words and even fear the revenge of rich Jews, whose intrigues reach far and who would consider such an accusation a general insult to the Israeli people and a personal insult to themselves. that this accusation is, no doubt, thorough, that there are Jews who, in their fanaticism, encroach on such outrageous villainy, but only asserted that this is not a proper Jewish rite, but an invention of the degenerates of mankind. A baptized, learned Jew is also serving in St. Petersburg, who with complete conviction confirms the existence of this rite - not in a general form, as it is expressed, but as an exception - but at the same time he refuses to testify to this anywhere. publicly, because, of course, they are not able to prove the truth of their words and even fear the revenge of rich Jews, whose intrigues reach far and who would consider such an accusation a general insult to the Israeli people and a personal insult to themselves. who, in their savagery, encroach on such outrageous villainy, but only asserted that this is not a proper Jewish rite, but an invention of the degenerates of mankind. A baptized, learned Jew is also serving in St. Petersburg, who with complete conviction confirms the existence of this rite - not in a general form, as it is expressed, but as an exception - but at the same time he refuses to testify to this anywhere. publicly, because, of course, they are not able to prove the truth of their words and even fear the revenge of rich Jews, whose intrigues reach far and who would consider such an accusation a general insult to the Israeli people and a personal insult to themselves.

Is it in this sense to believe [\(85\)](#) that such atrocities are committed by Christians to slander the Jews? To assume that there are Christians who, out of hatred for the Jews, are ready for such a more than brutal deed; although in our time, when the time of the crusades has long passed, it is difficult to admit this; but why do these people choose such a dangerous, false, even senseless revenge, which, as we have seen, every time almost turns on themselves, while the Jews remain right? One such lesson would be enough. It seems that such an assumption is too incoherent; it would be more direct, more natural, easier and more certain for such a zealot to take revenge directly on a Jew or Jews, by killing, instead of an innocent Christian baby, any Jew, or even several.

Our enlightened, philanthropic age, famous for its tolerance, which banished torture, fire and all persecution for faith, also armed itself with unbelief against such a terrible accusation of the Jews and indignantly rejects any possibility of such fanaticism. It would be too shameful for the whole of mankind, and it would be humiliating to believe in it, as in women's fairy tales, prejudices and superstitions. The Jews were persecuted - it's time to recognize them as brothers, equal to us; this accusation is a residue of ancient prejudices and attacks. Such reasoning, doing credit to our philanthropy, only proves that even the best direction has its weak side; condoling with the truly miserable state of the people of Israel, we get carried away, become biased and completely forget, we give up our fellow believers as a sacrifice, unconsciously pandering to some monstrous offspring of fanaticism. But the Jews were many times accused of this atrocity unjustly, as recently there was a case in Silesia, where a boy was found alive! This is true; and such an incident has always been the greatest triumph for the Jews, who, with noise and shouting, divulged it everywhere and covered themselves with it for a long time afterwards. But what does this prove? - how many times people have been unjustly accused of stealing or murdering - is it possible to conclude from this that there is no theft and murder in the world and that it is always the one who complains that he was robbed? If a Kazan peasant loses his horse, then his first word is: the Tatars have eaten it. If he later finds her in a forest or swamp, then his accusation in this case was unjust; however, it does not in the least weaken the well-known truth that the Tatars steal and eat horses.

But the Jews in England, France, Germany, educated, scholars - partly even statesmen and in any case conscientious, honest citizens, would they really not have discovered such an outrageous custom or sacrament of their faith, especially those of them who received holy baptism?

This objection leads to the final conclusion, to the end and purpose of the present investigation. At the beginning of this note, it was shown that many converted Jews actually did what could rightly be expected of them; such, for example, are the former rabbi, the monk Neofit, the former rabbi Serafinowicz, Pazdersky, Kiarini, Pikulsky, Savitsky, Grudinsky, and others mentioned above. The anti-Talmudists publicly asserted the same thing in a debate with the

rabbis in Lvov in 1759. But the number of such accusers, of course, is not large in comparison with the whole nation, and there are reasons for this: this fanatical rite not only does not belong to all Jews in general, but even, without any doubt, is known to very few. It exists only in the Hasidic sect or *Hasidim*, - as explained above - the most stubborn, fanatical sect, recognizing only the Talmud and rabbinic books and renouncing, so to speak, the Old Testament; but even here it is a great secret, perhaps not known to all of them, and at least, of course, not by all Hasidim and is not always fulfilled: there is no doubt, however, that it has never disappeared at all, since the spread of Christianity, and that from time to time fanatics and Kabbalistic healers appear among the Jews, who, with this dual purpose, encroach on the martyrdom of a Christian baby and use his blood with a mystical-religious and allegedly magical purpose. Poland and our western provinces, serving since the Middle Ages as a refuge for hardened and ignorant Jews, still represent the largest number of examples of such fanaticism,

## Notes:

1. Human.
2. "If the accusation is unfair" *no*
3. Levitz.
4. 25.
5. Talk.
6. And Christian by blood.
7. Jews believe in written and verbal law; the first is the *Torah*, the Old Testament, the second is the *Talmud*. This latter is divided into *Jerusalem*, completed already in the 2nd century and constituting a small book, and the *Babylonian*, or *Talmud proper*, which was completed by the rabbis and accepted by the councils of the Jews in the 5th century. It consists of two main parts, the *Mishnah* and the *Gemarah*, the first composes a text so obscure that it is completely incomprehensible without explanation; the second \* consists actually of these explanations, which are given a completely arbitrary and in the highest degree insane, reckless and monstrous meaning. One example is enough to show the spirit and direction of the Gemarra. The Old Testament says: "that a man should keep My commandments and live with them" (Moses book 3, ch. 18, article 5; Ezekiel, ch. 20, article 11). The Talmud interprets it this way: "that a man should live with My commandments, and not that he should die for them, which is why it is allowed, in case of need \*\*, to violate these commandments." (Talmud, Book of Avedozora, section 4, sheet 55),  
 \* Second... *no explanation*.  
 \*\* Needs.
8. According to the Velizh case of 1823, it was discovered that the Jews who encroached on this monstrous rite were also *Hasidim*.
9. Washed.
10. Secret.
11. The prophet Balaam was explained above.
12. Rawam.
13. What.
14. "At the funeral... with blood" *no*.
15. To kill Christians, where possible, the Talmud commands repeatedly. See book. Senhedrin, ch. 6, p. 48 and ch. 7, pp. 2 and 508; books. Avedozora, ch. 1, p. 3, ch. 2, p. 13, art. fifteen; book. Makeg, ch. 2, p. 9, art. 3, *ibid.*, ch. 71 and so on.
16. "Yayin Edym—Christian wine" *no*.
17. Entdecktes Judenthum, 1700.
18. Manhoshma.
19. From the Velizh case in 1823 it is also clear that the Jews hid and locked the child they had caught in a chest.
20. You'll stab.
21. Gatzik.
22. There is no "death to death".
23. Game.
24. Thiers.
25. Eisenmenger. T. II, r. 221; Munster's Cosmographia, p. 342; Hoffmann, Schwer zu bekehrendes Judenthum, p. 115. Tentzel, Monatliche Unterredungen.
26. Ioni
27. "In Frankfurt" *no*.
28. Finally.
29. Sun: "Hoffmann, Schwer zu bekehrendes Judenthum, p. 115, Tentzel. Monatliche Unterredungen"
30. Int.: "babies".
31. *No this §.*
32. Vst.: "Do not bury."
33. Eisenm. T. II, r. 233. Tentzel, Monatl. unterredungen., juli 1693; paperbroch. T. II, April.
34. Targets.
35. Killed.



36. "Five... hanged," *no*.
37. Derzhavin case.
38. *No this §.*
39. To.
40. betrayal of Judas.
41. *Vst.:* "those who traveled in that direction, others that only saw the Jews."
42. "And three Jews... froze" *no*
43. "And false" *is not*.
44. Der neue Pitaval, Leipzig, 1812, Vol. I.
45. Gazette des Eribunaux, 1844, le 13 mai.
46. Instead of: "in the statements" it reads: "witnesses".
47. *Vst.:* "Pavlovich".
48. Trough.
49. "Who circumcised" *no* .
50. The boy's sister, who left the house with him, testified that he did not want to go further with her, but sat down near the bridge.
51. Outside witnesses testified that they saw Hanna this morning standing at the gate of her house; and one, Kosachevskaya, who saw Hanna leading the boy by the hand.
52. Maksimova's daughter, Zhelnov's husband, who at that time came to the Tsetlins for something, saw the child in a chest, in a shirt, or covered with something white, but in a hurry did not take a good look at it.
53. The medical certificate says that the boy's stomach and intestines were empty, although he himself is well fed, from which it must be concluded that he did not eat anything during the last days before his death. \* "Before death" *no*.
54. This is also in full agreement, partly with the medical certificate, and partly with the sworn testimony of eleven witnesses.
55. This is also in full agreement, partly with the medical certificate, and partly with the testimony of witnesses.
56. *Vst.:* "Each one in turn drove a nail into the child's body."
57. *Vst.:* "slowly moved his feet."
58. This is also consistent with the medical certificate and with the testimony of witnesses.
59. According to the certificate in the church, it turned out that the dilapidated antimension had really been stolen, and Terentyeva showed, in full detail, how she stole it.
60. Seven witnesses testified under oath that they saw how this britzka galloped back and forth at dawn; and one woman, that the Jew Yosel was sitting in her.
61. "Then the Jews ... the city" *no*.
62. *Vst.:* "vodka."
63. *Vst.:* "Where did the blood go from the body?"
64. Terentyeva and Maksimova subsequently confessed to several similar atrocities committed together with the Jews, as was mentioned above.
65. Monstrous.
66. Punished.
67. *Vst.:* "and in general their behavior during interrogations."
68. *Vst.:* "As innocent."
69. *Int.:* "Fratka".
70. Face-to-face.
71. Sergievskaya.
72. Since the time of this case, in Vitebsk and the surrounding areas, a rumor has been preserved among the people that "after a soldier's son, not a single grain of pearls was left on the headdress of a Velizh Jewess." "You can still hear it today.
73. *Int.:* "Nata".
74. *Int.:* "stuttered."
75. "No" *no*.
76. In a chest.
77. In presence .
78. "They submitted" *no*.
79. *Here:* "was presented."
80. "Then Ereemeev ... repentance" *no*.
81. "And superstition ... thoroughly" *no*
82. Sunnis *are not*.
83. *Int.:* "Imam-Husseini".
84. *Int.:* "Isis".
85. Is there any point in the assumption.